Manual of Christian Theology

Hovey

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

BT75

Chap. ..... Copyright No. H75

Shelf 1900

copy 2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

MANUAL

OF

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

BY

ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AND GENERAL INTRODUCTIONS
IN THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION

SECOND EDITION

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
U.S.A.

SILVER, BURDETT AND COMPANY
NEW YORK BOSTON CHICAGO

copy 2

58886

Library of Congress
TWO COPIES RECEIVED
OCT 10 1900
Copyright entry
Sep. 17. 1900.
No A 23040
SECOND COPY.
Delivered to
ORDER DIVISION.
OCT 16 1900

BT75
.H75
1900
copy2

COPYRIGHT, 1900, BY ALVAH HOVEY

MVG-11M-39

PREFACE

In this revised edition of his Manual of Christian Theology the writer seeks to express as clearly as possible the views of Christian truth which fifty years of study have fixed in his mind. The work, however, is strictly a manual, not attempting to elaborate all the reasons for the views expressed, but leaving much to be supplied by the student or teacher. In the present state of theological inquiry a moderately full discussion of the subjects epitomized in this volume would have quadrupled its size, and it has been the writer's hardest task to bring into a narrow compass, by processes of omission and compression, what he had written *in extenso* for his own satisfaction.

In all parts of the Manual abundant references are made to the Holy Scriptures; often in the old way of appealing to single texts or expressions, but never without due regard to the whole context in ascertaining their meaning. It is far better for students to examine every proof-text in its original setting, than to have it brought before them in a quotation: hence numerous references and few citations. It is hoped that every reader of the volume will go through it with Bible in hand, and multiply its value a hundred fold by "searching the Scriptures daily whether these things are so" (Acts 17:11).

This edition of the Manual differs from the former edition in that it makes Christian Service a distinct Part of the work, on a par with Mankind, the Person and Work of Christ, the Christian Life, and Issues Hereafter; and it is hoped that this novelty of analysis will not be condemned without a generous attempt to appreciate the advantages which it offers in the study of theology as related to life.

It may also be remarked that the study of Angels has been relegated to an Appendix following Part Second, on Mankind, and that an attempt has been made to employ ordinary instead of technical language in speaking of theological questions. The old doctrines are not overlooked or depreciated, but discussed under new names.

The writer desires to make his grateful acknowledgments to the Rev. William Harston Goodall for help and encouragement in preparing this volume, to the Rev. John Russell Gow, for the careful Index of Subjects, costing much labor, and, above all, to one whose radiant courage, hopefulness, and devotion have been the light of his home and the joy of his heart for almost half a century. To her the reader is indebted for the Index of Bible References, and the writer, for counsel and suggestion in every part of the work.

May the Great Teacher accept this humble attempt to honor his Name!

ALVAH HOVEY.

NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,
NEWTON CENTRE.

September 1, 1900.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I. *Definitions:* 1. Of Christian Theology, 3; 2. Of Christian Religion, 3; 3. Of the Christian Religion, 3.

II. *Relations of Christian Theology:* 1. To Natural and Biblical Theology, 4; 2. To Apologetic, Polemic, and Comparative Theology, 4.

III. *Postulates of Christian Theology:* 1. Normal action of the mind trustworthy, 4; 2. Value of Evidence estimated by this, 5; 3. Value of probable Evidence variable, 5; 4. Knowledge of God possible, 6.

IV. *Cautions to Students of Theology against:* 1. Bold Inferences from the Infinite, 6; 2. Over-Confidence in Speculation, 7; 3. Pride of Opinion, 7; 4. Self-Interest, 7.

V. *Qualifications for this Study:* 1. Mental, 8; 2. Moral, 8; 3. Religious, 8; 4. Educational, 9.

VI. *Benefits of this Study:* 1. Mental, 9; 2. Moral, 9; 3. Religious, 10; 4. Practical, 10.

VII. *Divisions of this Study:* 1. According to this Manual, 10; — Part I. God in Nature and in Scripture, 10; Part II. Mankind: their Nature, Character, and Condition, 10; Part III. Jesus Christ: His Person and His Work, 11; Part IV. Christian Life: its Beginning and its Growth, 11; Part V. Christian Service, especially among men, 11; Part VI. Issues Hereafter, 11. 2. According to other works whose point of view is either (1) Trinitarian, 11; (2) Christocentric, 11; (3) Governmental, 12; or (4) Redemptive, 12.

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

PART FIRST. GOD

CHAPTER I. GOD REVEALED IN NATURE

I. *Trustworthiness of Nature's Teaching:* 1. Definition of Nature, 17; 2. Nature known but in part, 17; 3. This knowledge real and valuable, 17.

II. *Content of this Revelation:* 1. *Materialism indefensible:* (1) If matter is lifeless, 18; (2) If it is a two-sided entity, 19; (3) Objections to the latter hypothesis, 19.

2. *Monism unsatisfactory:* (1) Arguments for it criticised, 20; a. That it satisfies the logical appeal for unity, 20; b. That it dispenses with creation, 21; c. That it accounts for reciprocal action, 21; d. That it is sustained by biology, 22; e. And by certain texts of Scripture, 22. (2) Objections to Monism: a. Will force and physical force inconvertible, 23; b. Monism endangers human freedom, 24; c. And rejects the testimony of consciousness, 24.

3. *Theism is rational and credible:* (1) The Order of Nature favors it, 25; (2) The Marks of Design in Nature favor it, 26; (3) Objections answered, namely: a. That parts of living beings are useless, 27; b. That certain forces in nature are harmful, 28.

4. *The Genetic history of Nature Theistic:* Stages and transitions of evolution, 28: (1) From uniform substance to differing atoms, 29; (2) From atoms to vegetables, 29; (3) From vegetables to animals, 31. Objections to Theism from animal phenomena: a. Animals perish prematurely, 32; but (a) Abbreviated life is better than no life, 32; and (b) A perfect habitat for different species may be impossible, 32. b. Carnivora abound, 32; but (a) More living beings are thus possible, 33; (b) Death of animals well-nigh painless, 33. c. Useless parts of animals, 33; but these may be due (a) to God's love of symmetry, 33; (b) To his method of evolution, 33; or (c) To educational uses of the parts condemned, 33. (4) From animals to mankind — who are rational, moral, and religious beings, 33. a. Mankind are *Rational* beings, 34; animals are not. Notice, *e. g.,* (a) Size of the human brain, 34; (b) Human speech, 34; (c) The human hand, 34; (d) Constructive art

of Mankind, 34; (e) Man's appreciation of the sublime and beautiful, 34; (f) His power of imagination, 35; (g) His ability to form general concepts, 35; (h) His introspection, 35; (i) His aspiration and endless progress, 35. b. Mankind are *Moral* beings, 36; hence not the offspring of animals. (a) Their consciousness of duty and of law, 36; (b) Of a law-giver, 36; and (c) Of accountability to him, 36. c. Mankind are *Religious* beings: for (a) They put their dependence on a Higher Power, 37; (b) They recognize accountability to that Power, 37; (c) They are inwardly moved to worship, 37; (d) They crave a personal object of worship, 38; (e) Only a perfect being can satisfy them forever, 38; (f) The perfection of God is therefore credible, 38.

5. *A priori arguments in favor of this conclusion:* (1) The syllogism of Anselm criticised, 40; (2) The syllogism of Samuel Clarke criticised, 40; (3) The syllogism of Cousin criticised, 40; (4) Bearing of the *a priori* arguments on the question at issue, 40.

III. *The Revelation of God in Nature insufficient for mankind in their present moral condition:* 1. Because God's mercy to sinners is not clearly revealed in Nature, 41; 2. Neither is his treatment of them hereafter thus revealed, 41; 3. Nor what the Divine Being has done for them in the person of Christ, 41; 4. Nor what is the inner fulness of his life as the triune God, 41.

CHAPTER II. GOD REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE

As revelation in Scripture is supernatural, two objections are made to it: 1. It gives more light to some than to others, 42. Answer: (1) So does Providence, 42; (2) Both Scripture and Providence honor man's responsibility for what he has — much or little, 42. 2. It affirms supernatural aid which is incredible, 44. Answer: (1) God's action resembles that of the human spirit more than that of physical energy, 44; (2) Supernatural action tends to restore, not to disturb, the order of nature, 44; (3) Such action is neither impossible, incredible, or even improbable, 45.

First Proposition: The New Testament writings trustworthy as historical records. The trustworthiness of historical records depends on their date and their writers: Notice then, 1. That Christianity appeared about A. D. 30,

46; 2. That the New Testament Scriptures antedate A. D. 100, 47; 3. And were written by Apostles or their Associates, 47. Consider, especially, (1) Paul's conversion and character, 48; (2) His thirteen Epistles, especially the Undisputed Four, 48; (3) The historical contents of the Four, 48; (4) The Epistles of James, Jude, 1st of Peter, and 1st of John, 49; (5) Trustworthiness of the Gospels, as specially important, 49; a. Early Christian writers make them antedate A. D. 100, 50; b. All the early versions contain them, 50; c. The fourth Gospel, though written by John in his old age, trustworthy, 51; d. Relation of the Gospels to one another: Critical views, 52; e. The Evangelists men of good judgment, 54; f. And manifestly upright — no motive for misrepresentation, 54. Conclusion, 55.

SECOND PROPOSITION: THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS PROVE JESUS CHRIST TO HAVE BEEN AN INFALLIBLE TEACHER. Meaning of the word "infallible," 55; Method of proof, 56. 1. What Jesus claimed to know, 56; 2. His manner of teaching, 56; 3. Accord between the two, 57. Hence (1) His disciples believed his claim to be just, 58; (2) Readers of the Gospels have believed the same thing, 58; (3) His doctrines ratify his claim, 58; (4) His fulfilled predictions do the same: — the only apparent exception noted, 58; (5) His claim confirmed by miracles, 59. Definition and purpose of miracles, 59. Objections to them answered, 60. a. Human testimony for miracles said to be nullified: (a) By man's predisposition to believe in them, 60; (b) By the observed uniformity of nature, 60; (c) By the perfection of God's works in nature, 60; (d) By the fact that God is nothing but a blind force, 60. Answers: *a.* Every normal bias of the mind is towards truth, 60; *b.* The order of nature is changed by man, 61; *c.* A finite world complete in itself no better than one improvable, 61; *d.* The last objection owes all its force to atheism, 61; *e.* A single miracle refutes all these objections, 62; f. The testimony for Christ's miracles excellent, and his claim to infallibility ratified, 62.

THIRD PROPOSITION: THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS PROVE THAT JESUS CHRIST PROMISED THE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT TO HIS APOSTLES, BY WHOM, WITH SOME OF THEIR ASSOCIATES, THE NEW TESTAMENT WAS WRITTEN. 1. Meaning of inspiration as here used, 63; 2. Texts containing this great promise, 63; 3. What they naturally sig-

nify: (1) That the Holy Spirit would be Christ's Advocate with the Apostles, 64; (2) That he would bring to their remembrance Christ's teaching, 64; (3) That he would lead them into the whole truth, 64; (4) And thus qualify them to teach his gospel without error, 64. In their completeness these promises were fulfilled to the apostles only: a. They were addressed to them alone, 64; b. They assured them of specially needed help, 64; c. History forbids us to make the promises universal, 65; d. Yet some of them may be applied to all believers, 65; e. Paul was added to the primitive Apostles, 65; f. And so had with them a plenitude of gifts, 65; g. All Christians may have the benefit of them through the Scriptures, but the Apostles' teaching will never be superseded, 66.

Objections to the inerrancy of the Apostles as religious teachers: 1. They were not always true to their convictions: answer, 66; 2. They taught contradictory views of truth: answer, 67; 3. They misinterpreted the Old Testament: answer, 67; 4. They expected the visible return of Christ in their own day: answer, 67; 5. They admitted their forgetfulness and ignorance: answer, 67.

But some New Testament writers were not Apostles. (1) John Mark, an associate of Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, was one of these, 67; (2) Luke, the physician and companion of Paul, was another, 67; (3) James and Jude, brothers of Jesus, were others, 68; (4) The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews belongs to the same class, 68. All these were probably associates of the Apostles and perhaps inspired, 68.

FOURTH PROPOSITION: JESUS CHRIST, TOGETHER WITH THE APOSTLES AND THEIR ASSOCIATES, INDORSED THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES AS FROM GOD. 1. These Scriptures existed in the time of Christ, 69; 2. As is suggested by the Son of Sirach, 69; 3. And affirmed by Josephus contra Apionem, 69; yet 4. There was controversy about the canonicity of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, 70. Notice then: (1) How Jesus used the Old Testament writings, 70; (2) How they were used by Paul, 71; (3) How they differ from the New Testament, 71; (4) How this is justified by their character: They are distinguished a. For historic fairness, 72; b. For accuracy in local allusions, 73; c. For accuracy in their references to Oriental life, 73; d. For the fulfilment of some of their predictions, 73.

Why not of all? 73. (a) Many of them were conditional, 73; (b) Many were figurative and obscure, 73; yet (c) Their authors claimed to speak God's word, 74; (d) Their religious teaching was timely and progressive, 74; and (e) The spirit of essential Truth was in it. Our result thus far provisional, 75.

Mode of Inspiration. Theories named and discriminated. 1. *Theory of verbal plenary inspiration:* said to be required, (1) By the object of inspiration, 77; (2) By the use of language not understood by the speaker or writer, 77; (3) By the language, "Thus saith the Lord," 77; (4) By the adjective, theopneustic, in 2 Tim. 2:16, 77. Objections to this theory scrutinized: a. It fails to account for varieties of style in the sacred scriptures, 77; b. It disagrees with the free play of feeling indicated by their style, 78; c. It belittles the work of inspired men, 78.

2. *Theory of dynamical "plenary" inspiration:* which (1) defines inspiration as a direct influence of spirit on spirit, 79; (2) Agrees with the purpose of revelation, 79; (3) Allows of appropriation from others by inspired writers, 79; (4) Agrees with a useful distinction between inspiration and revelation, 80; (5) Accounts every thing in Scripture equally inspired, 80.

3. *Theory of dynamical "religious" inspiration:* which maintains, (1) That the purpose of Scripture is to make known religious truth, 80; (2) That the passages affirming inspiration limit it to religious truth. This theory modifies one's view of the inerrancy of Scripture in all non-religious teaching, 81.

4. *Theory of universal Christian inspiration,* 83. (1) The same Spirit is said to dwell and work in all renewed men, 83; (2) The prediction of Joel and the promise of Christ are applicable to all, 83; (3) Views of Dorner and Cave and author of this manual, 84.

Objections to this view of the Bible stated and answered: 1. That it tends to Bibliolatry, 86; 2. That it retards the progress of science, 86; 3. That it requires all copies, versions, and interpretations to be inerrant as well, 87; 4. That Scripture is often obscure, 88; 5. That it uses unsound arguments, 91; 6. That it interprets falsely, 92; 7. That it teaches scientific errors, 94; 8. That it contains historical errors, 97; 9. That it abounds in contradictions, 100; 10. That it

makes false predictions, 102; 11. That it teaches bad morality, 103; 12. That it teaches bad theology, 104. Hence the Bible is a trustworthy source of religious truth, that is, of truth concerning God and the way of life, 105.

CHAPTER III. RESULTANT DOCTRINE OF GOD

I. *That God is a living and morally perfect Being.* 1. *As such he has perfect knowledge:* (1) According to the testimony of Scripture, 107; (2) According to the demands of reason. 2. *As such he is perfectly righteous:* (1) According to the language of Scripture, 108; (2) According to human reason, 108. 3. *As such he has perfect feeling or love:* (1) According to Scripture, 109; and (2) According to our moral judgment, 109. 4. *As such he has perfect will or power:* (1) According to Scripture, 110; and (2) According to reason, 110. 5. *As such he is also triune,* 110; (1) According to the New Testament, 110; (2) And in order to fulness of life, 111. Difficulties of this doctrine briefly considered, 111.

II. *That God is an Infinite Being or Spirit.* 1. As such he is *independent* in respect to (1) his existence, (2) his knowledge, (3) his action, (4) his happiness, 113. 2. As such he is *immutable* in respect to (1) his essence, (2) his knowledge, (3) his character, (4) his purpose, (5) his blessedness, 113. 3. As such he is *eternal,* perhaps, *timeless;* though the latter point is mooted, 114. 4. As such he is *omnipresent,* 115.

III. *That God has an Eternal Purpose,* 116. This is both scriptural and reasonable. Let us consider the end sought by the divine purpose. This is said to be (1) The glory of God himself, 117; (2) The well-being of mankind, 117; (3) Two ends which may be resolved into one, 118. Objections criticised, viz., a. The presence of suffering in the world, 118; and b. The presence of sin, 118.

IV. *That God has created all things through the Word.* 1. What is meant by the act of creation, 120; 2. Objections to creation answered, 121; 3. The vastness of creation; 4. Men not the only rational beings created, 121.

V. *That God upholds all things through the Word,* 122. 1. This proposition opposed to deism, dualism, and pantheism, 122; 2. God's power a factor in everything that exists, 123; 3. Views of Harris (S.), Lotze (H.), Edwards (J.), 123;

4. What divine upholding really signifies, 124.; 5. Answer to an objection, 124.

VI. *That God provides for the fulfillment of his Eternal purpose,* 124. 1. God's providence defined, 124; 2. It is universal, 125; 3. It is rational, 126; 4. It is particular and instructive, 126; 5. It satisfies the Christian heart, 127.

PART SECOND. MANKIND

CHAPTER I. NATURE OF MANKIND

I. *Men are by nature bipartite:* 1. This is the common representation of Scripture, 132; 2. And is supported by consciousness, 132; 3. Texts supposed to favor a tripartite nature examined, 133; 4. Use of the words 'soul' and 'spirit' in Scripture, 134; 5. The two elements of man's nature interdependent here, 135.

II. *Men are by nature racial, or homogeneous:* as may be inferred, 1. From the language of Scripture, though Professor Winchell dissents, 136; 2. From their natural similarity the world over, 138; 3. Yet Genesis does not disprove an evolutionary origin of the body, 139.

III. *As racial men are reproductive:* This is undeniable as to the body, but as to the soul three hypotheses are defended, namely, 1. That of pre-creation, 139; 2. That of co-creation, 140, and 3. That of pro-creation, 141. 4. Bearing of these hypotheses on the nature of death and after-life, 142.

IV. *Men are by nature social beings:* 1. Evidence of this; 2. Importance of it, quotation from Saisset, 143.

V. *Men are by nature moral beings,* i. e., *subjects of moral law:* 1. Source and content of the moral law, 144; (1) Its source must be the moral nature of God, 145; (2) Its content must therefore be what his moral nature approves, in other words, likeness to himself; what He seeks men are bound to seek, the summum bonum for him is the summum bonum for them, 147; (3) This has been said to be either holiness or happiness, 148; (4) But neither of these comprises in itself all good; Both are intrinsically desirable, 148. (5) Objection to this view and further reasons for it, 148. 2. *Human faculties which condition moral action:* These are (1) knowing, (2) feeling, (3) desiring, and (4) willing, 149. 3. *In what part of action its moral quality*

resides: Answer; In the soul's choice of its ultimate end of action: in its deepest preference, 150. 4. *Is this inward and ultimate choice of the soul free or constrained?* (1) The teaching of the Scriptures is, a. That the actual sinfulness of men is certain, 151; b. That the first sin was man's free act, 151; c. That men are now morally weak, 152; d. That their duty to repent is unquestionable, 153; e. That they need God's help in doing this, 153. (2) The teaching of consciousness is, a. Conclusive for the fact of freedom (Hamilton, Lotze, Schurman), although, b. This has been often questioned (Alexander, A.), 154. (3) The teaching of logic, resting on the law of causation, is still doubtful: a. Reasoning of Jonathan Edwards, 155; b. Conclusion of Lotze, Schurman, and others, 156. 5. *Moral action necessarily free in all beings, good or bad:* (1) This fact must be steadfastly affirmed, 157; although (2) It must be difficult to reverse a settled choice, 158; (3) Propositions to be always maintained, 158.

CHAPTER II. THEIR CHARACTER

I. *As a race Mankind are sinful.* 1. *Definitions of sin:* (1) Want of conformity to the law of God, 160, criticism; (2) Inordinate desire, criticism, 161; (3) Deficiency of love to God, criticism, 161; (4) Preference of self to God, 162.

2. *All mankind are sinful, that is, inclined to wrong-doing:* (1) Alleged direct testimony of Scripture, 163; (2) Bodily death a fruit of sin, 163; (3) Christ's death for all, 163; (4) Man's nature vitiated at birth, 163; (5) Language of Ovid, Seneca, and others, 163.

3. *All mankind not equally sinful:* (1) As the Scriptures teach, 164; (2) Yet in a sense "totally depraved," 164; (3) Conscience with reason teaches the same: for, a. Man is accountable for every wrong voluntary act, 165; b. For any inclination to sin which he freely appropriates, 165; c. For any increase of this inclination due to his sinful action, 165; d. For the evil which he may expect to follow his sin, 166; e. For lack of improvement in moral capacity due to his sins, 166; f. For deterioration of moral capacity due to his sinning, 167; g. For failing to do all the good he might have done if he had been always faithful. Hence all men cannot be equally guilty, 167.

Is a man responsible for sin which he countenances in another? 1. He is responsible for countenancing the sin, 168; 2. And

countenancing sin encourages sinners, 168; 3. Yet there is a difference between inwardly approving and resolvedly doing, 169; 4. A man is guilty for any wrong act in proportion to his sympathy with it, 169; 5. Sinners are an alliance of evil-doers, 170; 6. So, too, the good need not work alone, 170; 7. But benefit from fellowship with the good is counterbalanced by disadvantages from fellowship with the bad, 170; 8. As sympathy grows responsibility grows, 170.

CHAPTER III. THEIR CONDITION

I. *As sinful mankind are condemned* — Notice six hypotheses concerning their responsibility for sin, especially in connection with their first parents: 1. The Pelagian hypothesis stated and criticised, 171; 2. The Arminian hypothesis stated and criticised, 172; 3. The Edwardean hypothesis stated and criticised, 173; 4. The Placean hypothesis stated and criticised, 173; 5. The Augustinian hypothesis stated and criticised, 173; 6. The Calvinistic hypothesis stated and criticised, 174.

II. *All men while unrenewed are exposed to punishment, without prospect of relief:* 1. Purpose of punishment, 176; 2. Elements of punishment, 177; 3. Media and agents of punishment, 178.

Other views: — 1. *That extinction of conscious being is the final punishment of unbelievers:* a. Because endless loss and pain would be too great a retribution for temporal sin, 179; b. Because a permanently miserable being is of no use to God or man, 180; c. Because eternal life is the fruit of union with Christ, 180; d. Because death always means extinction of conscious being, 180; e. Because the Scriptures deny conscious existence to wicked men after death, 181; f. Because they use other terms for punishment which point to extinction of consciousness, 181. 2. *That all the wicked will be restored through repentance, either here or hereafter:* (1) Because the presence of endless sin and suffering in the universe is incredible, 182; (2) Because the utter extinction of evil is predicted by some of the sacred writers, especially by Paul, 183; (3) Reply to these arguments. Natural evil is not purely retributive, 183.

APPENDIX. BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF ANGELS

I. *Their essence or substance:* (1) They are spiritual beings with no bodily organs. Texts a. b. c. d. make this probable

against other texts (a), (b), (c), (d) which suggest material bodies, 186. 2. *Their power in the universe is,* (1) Great, as compared with that of men, 189; (2) Yet limited in every direction, 190. *Their knowledge* is, (1) Very great, measured by our standards, 190; (2) But strictly finite, and, in some respects, inferior to man's, 190.

II. *Their character as moral beings.* 1. Many of them are *sinless,* 191; this appears from scripture passages (1), (2), (3), (4), 191; But how they have been established in righteousness we do not know, 192; Queries (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), 192. Many of them are *sinful.* This appears from texts (1), (2), (3). Queries suggested by Scripture, a. b. c. d. e., 193.

III. *Their employment.* 1. That of *good* angels may be inferred, (1) From *names* given to them in Scripture, 195; (2) From *actions* ascribed to them in Scripture, 195; (3) Their guardianship of particular nations or men is doubtful, 195; (4) They appear to be an organized host (a), (b), (c), (d), 197; (5) They appear to be very numerous, 197; (6) They should not be worshipped by men, nor asked to mediate between them and God, 197.

2. *That of evil angels.* This may be inferred, as in the case of good angels: (1) From their names, 198; (2) From their actions, 198; (3) Especially, from their taking possession of men, 198: a. By getting control of their bodily organs, 198; b. By producing physical disease, 198; c. Their presence revealed by signs unknown to us, 199; d. Their usurped control sometimes began early, 199; e. Their removal called "a casting out," 199; f. Some of the Jews practiced exorcism, 199; g. Evil angels a kingdom, and Satan their head; *Queries,* (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), 200.

PART THIRD. JESUS CHRIST: HIS PERSON AND WORK

The world prepared for his coming in at least eight particulars.

CHAPTER I. PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST

I. Person of Jesus Christ Divine. Conspectus of evidence, 1. *In the language of the Old Testament:* (1) *Historical*— concerning the Angel of Jehovah, 206; a. Dr. Goodspeed's analysis of this evidence, 206; b. The sign-presence of the

angel variable, 207; c. As "sent" not God in the absolute sense, but a revealer of God; d. Identified in the New Testament with the higher nature of Christ, 207. (2) *Prophetic* — concerning the Messiah to come. Objection to predictive messages answered: Typical prophecy as natural as direct prophecy. a. Psalms ii., xlv., lxxii., cx., and Isa. ix., 5, 6, all either directly or typically Messianic. b. The same is also true of Micah 5:2-5; Mal. 3:1, and Dan. 7:13, 14, 208.

2. *In the language of Jesus Christ himself:* (1) In the synoptical Gospels, a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h.; (2) In the fourth Gospel, a. b. c. d. e. as compared with (a), (b), (c), (d), (e); (3) In the book of Revelation, a. b. c. d. e., 212.

3. *In the words of New Testament-writers:* (1) In the Synoptical Gospels and James, Jude, and Peter, a. b. c., 216; (2) In the writings of Paul, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h. i., 217; (a) Meyer's interpretation of Rom. 9:5. 218; (b) Better interpretation of Sanday and Headlam; (c) Notes on 1 Tim. 3:16; Eph. 5:5; and Titus 2:13, 217. (3) In the writings of John. John's object in writing his Gospel, 220; he teaches clearly the divine nature of Christ, a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h., 221; (a) Meyer's interpretation of Jo. 1:1. 221; (b) Green on the omission of the article before θεός, 222; (c) de Pressensé's view of John's relation to Philo, 222; (d) Notes on Jo. 20:28, Leathes and Luthardt, 223; (e) On 1 Jo. 5:20, a. b. c. d. e., 224; (f) On Jo. 1:18; not a proof passage, 225; (4) Use of κύριος by New Testament writers in speaking of Christ, 225.

II. Person of Jesus Christ Human. Study limited to the New Testament: why? 226. The humanity of Jesus Christ is taught by texts: 1. Which denominate him man, 227; 2. Which call him the Son of man; 3. Which ascribe to him human properties and susceptibilities, 227; 4. Which speak of his flesh, etc.; 5. Which describe his official work, a. b. c. d., 227.

III. Jesus Christ Unipersonal. 1. Controversy in the early church, 228; 2. Decision of the Trullan Council, 229; 3. This decision formally correct, 229; 4. Post-Reformation creeds assert the personal unity of Christ: Reasons for affirming this: (1) His conception and birth, 230; (2) His use of the personal pronouns 'I' and 'me' and 'my,' 230; (3) His resurrection and ascension as one person, 230;

(4) His referring both sides of his nature to himself as one being, 230.

IV. EACH CONSTITUENT WAS AFFECTED BY ITS UNION WITH THE OTHER, 231. I. *This true of his* DIVINITY: 1. Theory of Apollinaris stated and criticised, 231; 2. Theory of Nestorius stated and criticised, 232; 3. Theory of Cyril stated and criticised, 232; 4. Theory of Leo stated and criticised, 233; 5. Theory of Gess stated and criticised, 233; (1) Statement of it = Kenoticism, 233; (2) Arguments for it criticised, a. b. c., 234; (3) General objection to Kenoticism, 234; 6. Theory of Thomasius stated, with objections, a. b. c., 237; 7. Theory of Dorner stated with favor, 238; 8. Author's Theory explained (1), (2), (3), and supported, a. b. c., 238.

II. *This true of his* HUMANITY *also:* 1. Human nature of Jesus purified at conception, 241; 2. Per contra: see Edward Irving, a. b. c., 242; 3. Human nature of Jesus specially assisted by the Holy Spirit, 244; 4. It was also helped by his divine Nature, 244; 5. Bearing of this view on Mark 13:38, etc., 244.

V. REASONS FOR THE INCARNATION. Some theologians hold that the incarnation would have taken place if men had never sinned. In proof of this appeal is made:

1. To several texts of Scripture. Criticism, 245; 2. To the nature of the case. Criticism, 245; Per contra, (1), (2). Teaching of Dr. Samson, 246.

CHAPTER II. WORK OF JESUS CHRIST

The Offices of Christ; especially, THE SELF-SACRIFICE OF CHRIST. The term self-sacrifice preferred to "atonement," "propitiation," "satisfaction," or "redemption," 248. Definitions of terms used, Moral good and Natural good, Moral evil and Natural evil, 249. Biblical grounds for the self-sacrifice of Christ, 252: 1. It is represented as necessary, 252; 2. As the fruit of God's love to men, 253; 3. As the fruit of his righteousness as well as of his grace, 254; 4. As propitiatory, 258; 5. As a ransom for sinners, 260; 6. As a basis for intercession, 262. a. Inferences (a), (b), (c), 262; and confirmations, *a. b. c.,* 262.

Theories of the Atonement, or Self-sacrifice of Christ: 1. That its value consists in its moral influence only, 264; 2. That

it consists in its being a substitute for penalty, 266; 3. That it consists in suffering the penalty of sin in place of the sinner, 267; 4. That it consists in a natural union of Christ with sinful men, 268.

CONCLUSION. 1. There are elements of truth in every one of these theories, 270; 2. No one is wholly satisfactory, 270; 3. God's righteousness and love both equally satisfied by the self-sacrifice of Christ, 274; 4. But how can righteousness be illustrated by the suffering of the innocent in place of the guilty? 271; 5. Mankind are a family in which the good must sometimes suffer for the bad, 271; 6. This family includes a divine human being able and willing to suffer for his brothers, 272. FINAL PROPOSITIONS, SUPPOSED TO BE AT ONCE *Biblical and reasonable,* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 272, 275; OBJECTIONS, REVIEWED.

1. Christ's work was finished before his crucifixion, 276; 2. The penalty of sin is chiefly spiritual, and Jesus could not suffer spiritual death = remorse, 276; Answers: (1), (2), (3), 277; Dr. Bruce's statement, 278.

THE SELF-SACRIFICE OF CHRIST MADE FOR ALL MEN. 1. This statement is scriptural, though rejected by many Calvinists, 278; 2. It does not conflict with the doctrine of God's eternal purpose, 278; 3. God removes every objective barrier to the salvation of unbelievers, 278; 4. The self-sacrifice of Christ probably insures the salvation of those who die in infancy, 279.

PART FOURTH. CHRISTIAN LIFE

CHAPTER I. BEGINNING OF CHRISTIAN LIFE

I. *Relation of the Father to its beginning.* This may be seen 1. *In the doctrine of Election:* 1. Relation of purpose and election, 283; 2.-5. Illustrative instances of election, 283-284; 6. Fact of election to life clearly taught, 284; 7. God has good reasons in every case for election. One of these suggested by Paul, 285; 8. Another, in the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians, 285; Another, by the true doctrine of prayer, 286; 10. Another, by the world's progress through human agency, 286; The principle of Calvinism stated, 287; Objections to this doctrine answered, 278; In what sense is God no respecter of persons, 288.

2. *In the doctrine of Providence:* (1) Close connection between election and providence, 289; (2) Training of men in society and business, 289; (3) Individuals cared for by their heavenly Father, 289.

II. *Relation of Jesus Christ to the Beginning of Christian life.*

1. *As Revealer of divine holiness and love, especially through his self-sacrifice:* (1) Through a well-ordered creation, 290; (2) Through the teaching of his prophets, 290; (3) Through his personal incarnation and self-sacrifice, 291; (4) Through the ministry of his apostles and the written Word, 291; (5) Knowledge of Christ's self-sacrifice moves to repentance and trust, 292.

In proof of this we appeal: a. To the contrast between the effect of preaching before and after the resurrection of Christ, 292; b. To Paul's description of the gospel he preached, 292; c. To the Apostles' account of the influence of Christ's love on their hearts, 292; d. To the history of Christendom through the ages, 293.

2. *As Ruler of the divine kingdom:* (1) Jesus Christ is now acting as mediatorial king, 293; (2) As such he imparts to believers their spiritual life through the Holy Spirit, 294; (3) As such he is their advocate or patron with the Father, 294; (4) As such he will be the final judge of all, 294.

III. *Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Beginning of Christian Life.*

Preparatory study concerning the Holy Spirit. 1. *Deity of the Holy Spirit:* (1) Divine attributes and actions ascribed to him, 294; (2) He is associated with the Father and the Son in religious acts, 294; (3) He is called God, directly or implicitly, 294.

2. *Personality of the Holy Spirit:* Triunity no more incredible than biunity, 295. (1) Christ teaches it, 295. (2) New Testament writers teach it, 296.

Objections answered: (1) The Father said to be the efficient cause of miracles, etc., 297; (2) The Holy Spirit called the Spirit of God, 297; (3) The Holy Spirit related to God as man's spirit to man. Caution from Augustine, 289; (4) The tripersonality of God not to be obscured. Statement of Dr. Pepper, 299.

3. *Identity of the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of God.* (1) The latter appellation is sometimes interpreted by the former, 300; (2) The same functions attributed to the one as to the other, 300. Passages a. b. c., 300.

We come now to our special topic, the "*Holy Spirit's relation to the beginning of Christian Life.*"

That he is, in a special sense, the Author of this life is inferred from biblical representations which speak of the origin of Christian life under the figure, 1. of generation or birth, 301; 2. of resurrection from the dead, 302; 3. of creation or new-creation, 303; 4. of divine calling or drawing, 303. Hence not in conflict with free will, 304.

IV. *Relation of Men to the Beginning of their Christian Life.*

The following conditions may be expected: 1. Knowledge of the gospel, 305; 2. Earnest attention to the same, 305; 3. Conviction of sin, 305; 4. Anxiety to be saved, 305; 5. Sense of need of help in order to be saved, 306: (1) Maclaren's comment on Matt. 9:20 ff., 306; (2) We do not affirm that none of the heathen or ancient Israelites possessed spiritual life, 306; (3) Nothing done by an impenitent man establishes a just claim to the mercy of God, 307.

First workings of the new life: 1. "Repentance," which is an inward turning to God, 307; 2. "Faith," which is genuine trust in Christ, 308; 3. "Love," which is a supreme preference for God in Christ, 308; 4. "Hope," which expects future good, 309; 5. "Spiritual insight," which depends on right affection, 309.

V. *Relation of the Gospel to the Beginning of Christian Life.*

Two theories: that truth originates Christian life, and, that truth acts with the Spirit in originating it, 309. 1. The gospel is certainly a means of faith, love, hope, and insight, 310; 2. But in bringing one to repentance it only complements the work of the Holy Spirit, 310; 3. How then are the work of the Spirit, the influence of truth, and the action of the sinner related to each other? 311: (1) The working of the Spirit and the influence of truth move the sinner to repent, 311; (2) But they appear to act in different ways — one subconsciously, the other under the eye of consciousness, 311; (3) The new birth includes the first movement of the new life, 311.

VI. *Alleged relation of Baptism to the Beginning of Christian Life:* 1. The Creed of Romanists on this subject, 312; 2. The Creed of Lutherans on this subject, 313; 3. The Doctrine of the Anglican Liturgy on this subject. Against the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration are these facts, 313: (1) That baptism was regularly preceded by faith, 313; (2) That some were filled with the Spirit before baptism, 314; (3) That baptism was held to be "the answer of a good conscience," 314; (4) That administering baptism was regarded by Paul as less important than preaching the gospel, 314; (5) That he claims to have begotten through the gospel many whom he did not baptize, 314.

How the passages supposed to teach baptismal regeneration ought to be understood, a. b. c., 315.

CHAPTER II. GROWTH OF CHRISTIAN LIFE

I. *Relation of the Father to the* GROWTH *of Christian Life:* 1. The Father justifies believers in Christ, 317; 2. He adopts them as his children, 318; 3. Signification of the word "justify," 318; 4. Forgiveness and justification separable in thought but not in fact, 319; Remarks on justification (1) (2) (3) (4), 320; 5. Believers in Christ are justified on account of what Christ has done for them. This we learn: (1) From the direct testimony of Scripture, 320; (2) From the indirect testimony of Scripture, 321; 3. According also to the testimony of John; 4. And according to the testimony of Christians since the first age; 5. How this relation is mediated, 328.

II. *Relation of Jesus Christ to the Growth of Christian Life:* 1. Closeness and directness of this relation, 326; 2. Teachings of Paul in respect to the union of believers with Christ, 327; 3. Similar teaching of John, 327; 4. Testimony of Christians in general, 327; 5. Influence of Christ's words and acts on believers, 328.

III. *Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Growth of Christian Life:* 1. Spiritual insight is traced to the Holy Spirit as its source, 329; 2. Christian virtues are traced to the Holy Spirit as their source, 329; 3. Christian conduct and worship are referred to the Holy Spirit as their source, 329; 4. Christian conflict with evil propensities and victory are referred to the Holy Spirit as their source, 329; 5. Christian life depends upon union with Christ through his Spirit, 330; 6. Sanctification is directly ascribed to the Spirit, 330;

7. The Holy Spirit's help was necessary to good men before Christ as it is to good men now, 331.

IV. *Relation of Believers to the Growth of Christian Life in themselves and others:* 1. True worship promotes this growth, 331; (1) The nature of prayer, a. b. c. d., 332; (2) Particular features of it, a. b. c. d. e., 332-333.

Two objections to petition in prayer answered; (a) Founded on human ignorance: Answers *a. b.,* 334; (b) Founded on the order of Nature: Answers *a. b. c. d.,* 335-337; (3) Further evidence from Scripture that prayer is answered, 337; (4) Rousseau's misapprehension as to prayer, 337. 2. Study of God's Word and Providence promotes this growth, 338. 3. Doing his will is conducive to spiritual knowledge and growth, 339.

PART FIFTH. CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Conscious affection depends upon knowledge, and actual service upon opportunity, 342.

CHAPTER I. IN FAMILY LIFE

1. This is the primary sphere for Christian service, 343; 2. With children and servants it is a sphere for the most permanent usefulness, 343; By family worship Christian life is made pure and deep, 343.

CHAPTER II. IN NEIGHBORHOOD LIFE

1. This, in country places, is next in social importance to family religion; 2. Neighborhood meetings are often extremely useful; (1) By enkindling devotion to God; (2) By increasing brotherly love; (3) By securing the blessing of God, 344.

CHAPTER III. IN CHURCH LIFE

Note, on the double advantage of church life, 345.

I. Christian Churches. 1. Apostolic Church Polity instructive, 346. 2. Definition of a Christian Church, 347. 3. Fraternal equality of its members, 348. 4. Their duty in receiving or excluding members, 348. 5. Qualifications for church membership, 349. 6. All members responsible for discipline, 350. 7. Churches select their own officers, 351. 8. They ought to

respect each other's action, 351. 9. Coöperation of churches, 352. 10. Lay members to respect and support their officers, 352. 11. Deacons to assist pastors, especially in caring for the sick and poor, 353. 12. Duties of pastors, spiritual leadership, etc., 354. 13. Work of evangelists, 359. 14. Apostles no longer necessary, 359.

II. Christian Ordinances: Christian Baptism. 1. *External Rite, includes immersion:* Notice (1) Meaning of βαπτισμα from βαπτίζω, 360; (2) Meaning of λουτρόν from λούω, 361; (3) The circumstances of baptism, 361; (4) Allusions to its import, 362; (5) Testimony of early Christian writers, 363; (6) The practice of the Greek Church, 363; (7) Concessions of learned Pædobaptists, 363; (8) The use of the prepositions, ἐν εἰς, and ἐκ, 364.

Objections answered: (1) From Luke 13:38 compared with Mark 7:2, 4, 8, 365; (2) From Acts 2:41 and 4:4, 365; (3) From the use of βαπτίζω instead of *immergo* in an early Latin version, 366; (4) From the small size of some early fonts, 366; (5) From the outpouring (= baptism) of the Spirit at Pentecost, 367; (6) Strictness in adhering to the form of a rite is unspiritual, 367; The formula to be used in baptism, 368.

2. *Significance of the Rite:* (1) It symbolises the new birth of the subject, 369; (2) Through union with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection, 369; (3) It represents the new birth as a purifying change, 370.

3. *Subjects of the Rite: Only those who give credible evidence of faith in Christ:* (1) As shown by the great commission, 372; Objections to this interpretation answered, 373; (2) As shown by the practice of apostles, 373; (3) As shown by apostolic language concerning it, 374; (4) As shown by the usage of the Church for two centuries or more, 374.

Pædobaptists say, *believers and their children:* 1. Because baptism takes the place of circumcision. Answer, (1), (2), (3), (4), 375-376; 2. Because entire households were baptized by the Apostles. Answer, 376; 3. Because Christ said concerning little children, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Answer, 377; 4. Because children are said to be holy by virtue of their parents' faith. Answer, 377; 5. Because the Jews would have complained if their little children had not been baptized. Answer, 377; 6. Because the early Church admitted the children of believers to baptism. Answer; Remarks (1), (2), (3), 378.

4. *Relation of the Rite to John's baptism.* (1) John and therefore his baptism, belonged to the Old Testament dispensation, 379; (2) He could not have baptized into the name of the trinity, 379; (3) His followers would not have needed baptism when they became Christians, 380.

But on the other hand: a. The ritual act must have been the same in both cases, 380; b. The same spiritual preparation was required in both cases, 380; c. Baptism was not commonly repeated when his followers became Christians, 381; d. It was not surely in the case of the Apostles, 382; e. The New dispensation is represented as beginning with the work of John, 382.

The Lord's Supper. 1. *The External Rite:* (1) The elements were bread and wine, 383; (2) Their ritual use embraced three acts, a., b., c., 383.

2. *The import of the Rite:* (1) It symbolizes the reception of Christ by faith, 384; (2) It commemorates the self-sacrifice of Christ in his death, 384; (3) It foreshadows the marriage supper of the Lamb. Remarks, a., b., c., d., e., f., g., 385-387.

3. *The proper communicants:* (1) Should any save credible believers be invited to the supper? Answer, a., b., c., 387-388; (2) Should any save baptized believers be invited? a., b., 388-389; Objections by Robert Hall and others answered, (a), (b), (c), (d), 389; (3) Should any save those whose church-walk is orderly be invited? Answer a. b., and under b. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), 390-393.

III. Effect of Church Life. 1. It cultivates a spirit of obedience to Christ, 395; 2. It maintains the practice of social worship, (1), (2), (3), 396; 3. It secures an increase of Christian knowledge, 395; 4. It promotes, by its discipline, watchfulness and consistency, 397; 5. It organizes and stimulates labor for the good of others, 397.

CHAPTER IV. THE LORD'S DAY

I. *Duty of keeping the Lord's Day.* Beliefs entertained on this subject: 1. That men are under no obligation to keep it — for one of two reason. Criticism, 399; 2. That Christ substituted the Lord's Day for the Sabbath. Criticism, 399; 3. That the practice or authority of the Church requires Christians to keep the Lord's Day. Criticism, 400; 4. That the example of the Apostles is our authority for

keeping the Lord's Day: supported by four facts, (1), (2), (3), (4), 400-401.

II. *Manner of keeping the Lord's Day:* 1. Employments embraced in, or prerequisite to, religious service, 402; 2. Employments necessary to the preservation of life and health, 402; 3. Employments required for the prevention or relief of severe suffering, 402; Further considerations in support of this view, (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), 403-405.

CHAPTER V. PERIOD OF GROWTH AND SERVICE

I. *Perfection of Christian Service:* Is this ever reached in the present life? 407; 1. Perfect service presupposes a perfect heart, 407; 2. No man's self-consciousness can be a proof of perfect service, 407; 3. 1 John 3:9; 5:18 do not prove perfection of Christian life or service in any believer, 408; 4. What the language may signify, 408; 5. No division of Christians into two classes tenable, 409.

II. *Abandonment of Christian Life and Service:* Arguments in favor of the doctrine of "Falling from Grace," answered, 410; 1. Analogy is said to favor this doctrine, 410; 2. Christians are exhorted to persevere, 411; 3. Christians are warned against apostatizing, 411; 4. Cases of apostasy are supposed possible or actual, 412; 5. Instances of apostasy are related, 412. The other side of the question, 413.

PART SIXTH. ISSUES HEREAFTER

CHAPTER I. ISSUES FOR BELIEVERS

I. *In Death. Its Relation to Christian Life:* 1. Definition of physical death, 417; 2. Consciousness after death, 417; 3. Figurative references to it in Scripture, 417; 4. Quotation from Professor John Fiske, 418; 5. Relation of death to the moral condition of man, 419; 6. Quotation from Heard, 419.

II. *In Paradise. Its Relation to Christian Life:* 1. After death believers are in paradise, 420; 2. After death believers are in Abraham's bosom, 420; 3. After death believers are with Christ their Lord, 420. Further: (1) They are immortal like angels, 421; (2) Their perception of spiritual beings is doubtless more distinct than that of material things, 422; (3) Their relation to time and space is modified, but they are still finite beings, 422; (4) No intimation of sin in that state, 422.

III. *In the Resurrection. Its Relation to Christian Life:* 1. The Apostles testify that Jesus foretold his own resurrection, 423; 2 They testify that he appeared to them many times after his resurrection, 424; 3. They predict the resurrection of all believers in Christ: (1) By recording the words of Christ, 426; (2) By testifying their own belief, 426. 4. They predict a resurrection of believers with real bodies, 426; 5. They represent the bodies of raised saints as being very different from their earthly bodies, 426; 6. They teach that they are adapted to spirit-life, 427; 7. Yet that they will be in some respects similar to their present bodies, 427. Three suppositions as to the time when Christ's body was changed from natural to spiritual: (1) Before he left the tomb, 428; (2) Between his resurrection and ascension, 428; (3) At his ascension, 428; (4) Christians, like Christ, can have sensible relations with material things after their resurrection, 429. *When are believers in Christ to be raised from the dead?* 8. Answer: at the last day, the end of this age, 429. Yet three distinct beliefs are held on this point: a. The resurrection of believers takes place at the time of their death, 429; (a) Answer to their interpretation of Luke 20: 34-38, 430; (b) Answer to their interpretation of John 11: 25, 26, 430; (c) Answer to their interpretation of 1 Cor. 15: 36-38, 42-44, 430. Modification of this view by Dr. I. P. Warren, 431. b. The resurrection of believers will take place just before the millennium, 432; (a) Answer to their interpretation of Rev. 20: 4-6, 432; (b) Answer to their interpretation of other passages, 433; (c) Answer to their interpretation of still other representations, 434; (d) No clear proof that risen saints will live and reign with Christ on the earth, 435. *Per contra: a.* Jesus taught his disciples that it would be better for them to have the invisible Spirit as a Helper than his own visible presence, 435; *b.* Peter appears to have taught the same thing by implication, 435; *c.* Compare also Paul's teaching in several places, 436; *d.* Other Statements of New Testament writers referred to, 437; *e.* Objections to the hypothesis that the soul has an organific power, answered, (*a*), (*b*), 437-438.

IV. *In the Last Judgment. Its Relation to Christian Life:* 1. The Scriptures predict a last judgment, 439; 2. And this, a general judgment, 439; 3. Also, a righteous judgment, 440; 4. Administered by Jesus Christ, 440.

V. *In the After Life of Believers:* 1. Quotation from Julius Müller, 440; 2. Body made a perfect organ of spirit, 441; 3. Sight and hearing of wider range, 441; 4. Rational love in perfect service, 442.

CHAPTER II. ISSUES FOR UNBELIEVERS

I. *Relation of Death to Unbelievers:* 1. The same in itself to them as to believers, 443; 2. Sometimes met with a very different feeling, 443.

II. *Relation of Hades to Unbelievers:* Parable of Dives and Lazarus. Hypothesis of conversion in Hades based on 1 Pet. 3:19 unstable: 1. Aim of this Epistle to encourage Christians in times of persecution, 444; 2. Aim of the paragraph quoted precisely this, 444; 3. Earlier in the Epistle the Spirit of Christ in the ancient prophets is spoken of, 445; 4. Not improbably Peter speaks of Noah's ungodly contemporaries as "the spirits [now] in prison," 445; 5. Others rest on Matt. 12:32 as implying forgiveness and so conversion in Hades. Answer, 445; 6. In the nature of the case, forgiveness follows conversion, 446; 7. But there is no substantial ground for believing in conversion after death, 447.

III. *Relation of the Resurrection to Unbelievers:* 1. Only two, possibly three passages of the New Testament teach the resurrection of unbelievers, 447; 2. And these do not indicate the kind of bodies they will have, 447.

IV. *Relation of the Last Judgment to Unbelievers:* 1. Many of Christ's nominal friends will be found with unbelievers, 448; 2. Some of the wicked will be doomed to less woe than others, 449; 3. The precise result of sin and woe in the final state are not revealed. Conscience will survive, 450.

MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION[1]

I. Definition of Christian Theology

BY Christian Theology is meant *the science of the Christian religion,* or the science which ascertains, jutsifies, and systematizes all attainable truth concerning God and his relation, through Jesus Christ, to the universe and especially to mankind.

The word "science" is here used to signify knowledge correctly arranged or systematized, a knowledge of principles as well as of facts, of causes and effects as well as of events. Hence the science of the Christian religion must be a well-ordered and coherent exposition of the facts and principles of that religion.

"Religion," in its primary sense, is reverence or piety towards God, and, at its best, a life of cordial service to him. It pervades the whole man, thought, feeling, and will, and in the *Christian* use of the term, signifies *a life of filial service to God as he is revealed to us in Jesus Christ.* Less exactly it has been defined "a life from God, with God and in God."[2]

[1] Literature: *Smith* (H. B.), "Introduction to Christian Theology"; *Weidner* (R. F.), "An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology"; *Cave* (Alfred), "Introduction to Theology and its Literature"; *Crooks* (G. R.), and *Hurst* (J. F.), "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology"; *Schaff* (P.), "Theological Propædeutic"; and the Introductions of *Strong* (A. H.), *Miley* (J.) and other theologians to their works; also *Kuyper* (A.), "Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology" (1898, pp. 228-627).

[2] De Pressensé.

In its secondary sense, religion signifies the means by which personal piety is originated and increased among men, and, so used, 'the Christian religion' embraces in itself all the facts, principles, and modes of action revealed by Jesus Christ, as conditioning a life of acceptable service to God.

II. Relations of Christian Theology

1. *Christian Theology is dependent on Nature and Revelation*, or, in other words, on Natural and Biblical Theology, for the facts and principles which it correlates and interprets. It is also dependent, though in a less degree, upon the History of the Christian religion among men. And finally, in a still less degree, it is dependent on Logic and Metaphysics for the best use of its data.

2. On the other hand, Christian Theology furnishes important data for Apologetic, Polemic, and Comparative Theology. For, in order to justify a religion effectively, one needs to know what it is and how it originated, as well as what it has done. In order to elucidate controverted points in Christian doctrine, one needs a good knowledge of the whole system. And lastly, one who undertakes to compare Christianity with other religions, — as Buddhism, Islamism, or Confucianism, — should have a comprehensive knowledge of Christian Theology, as well as of the religious systems with which it is compared.

III. Postulates of Christian Theology

Christian Theology must assume:

1. *That the normal action of the human mind is trustworthy.* A denial of this postulate is logically absurd, for all reasoning presupposes the trustworthiness of our rational powers, and all men appeal to reason as deserving respect. Besides, it is self-evident that a denial of

the validity of mental action must be itself a mental act, and therefore worthless, if mental action is unworthy of confidence.

Yet by assuming that the normal action of the human mind is trustworthy, we do not assume that it is infallible, any more than we assume that human eyesight is perfect when we say that "seeing is knowing." The mind's grasp of a complex problem is often less perfect than its grasp of a simple problem; but the mind is itself aware of this difference, and the positiveness of its conviction is proportioned to the clearness of its comprehension.

2. *That the value of evidence is measured by its power to originate knowledge or belief.* It can be measured in no other way. Of course, it may be submitted to many minds, and when all of them estimate it alike its value is more certain than it is in case of disagreement.

Evidence may be divided into three kinds:

(1) That which is furnished by direct cognition, namely, axiomatic or necessary truths.

(2) That which is furnished by clear perception or recollection; it being in either case indubitable.

(3) That which is furnished by testimony or analogy; this kind of evidence being variable in force and often characterized as probable.

It is also necessary to bear in mind two other facts:

3. *That probable evidence may have almost any degree of convincing power,* from the highest to the lowest. In some cases it is perfectly conclusive, in others it is simply preponderant, in still others it is feeble or wholly unsatisfactory.

Probable evidence is often cumulative, so called, because it results from putting together a great many particulars no one of which is of much weight by itself, though the combination may be decisive. Many questions of Biblical Criticism can only be answered by this

kind of evidence. But this fact should occasion no surprise, for probability is the guide of life, and the soundest minds are those that best perceive the force of probable evidence. It is an accepted maxim, that judgment and conduct are bound to follow the stronger evidence, and the same principle requires us to credit even weak evidence when there is nothing against it.

4. That *men have some true knowledge of God.* This knowledge is never full or perfect, but it is nevertheless real. They know him but in part as they know all other beings whom they know at all but in part.

Agnostics deny this:

(1) Because our senses do not reveal God to us.

This may be granted; but our senses do not reveal to us our mental action, or the causal energy in nature, or mathematical axioms, though our knowledge of these is incontestable.

(2) Because our mental powers are finite and therefore cannot grasp what is infinite.

It is true that our mental powers cannot comprehend the infinite, but it is equally true that they cannot comprehend the magnitude of the sun or of the solar system; and if we do not question their partial knowledge of the latter, there is no solid ground for disputing their partial knowledge of the former. We know in part. All our knowledge is fragmentary, but it is not therefore untrustworthy, as far as it goes. Says President Schurman: "Man, because he is rational, must believe in God as Universal First Cause; atheism is, in the strictest sense of the term, irrational." [1]

IV. Cautions to Students of Christian Theology

1. *Against rashness of reasoning from the Infinite to the Finite.* Ground for special caution in this case may

[1] Scientific Agnosticism, p. 27.

be found in the fact that one of the premises is imperfectly known. Finite intelligence may not know how infinite intelligence will act in given circumstances. To infer, for example, from the perfection of God that all his works will be absolutely and unchangeably perfect is rash. To infer from the perfect love of God that there can be no sin or suffering in the world is equally rash. To infer from the sovereignty of God that man is not a free moral agent is also rash. For in each of these instances the inference is from cause to effect, while the cause is imperfectly known.

2. *Against giving too high a place to philosophical speculation.* A man addicted to philosophical thought is in constant danger of trusting to his reason, and neglecting Revelation. He is tempted to leave the comparatively solid ground of facts, verified by experience or supported by testimony, and to soar aloft on the wings of rational inference. There is need of guarding against a tendency to rely upon *a priori deduction* instead of historical evidence. Both are needful.

3. *Against yielding unconsciously to pride of opinion.* Men do not willingly confess themselves to be in error on any subject which they claim to understand. Having avowed an opinion they feel themselves bound in honor to defend it. To give it up as erroneous is like surrendering a post in war. This pride of opinion, this disposition to maintain the honor of one's own intellect, is in many ways useful; but it is often excessive, and needs to be curbed by a deep sense of the vastness of the realm of truth and by a strong desire to explore that realm as widely as possible.

4. *Against giving place to selfishness.* A wider caution than the preceding; for a culprit is not apt to approve the law or the judge that condemns him, and, according to the Christian religion, all men are culprits. Hence they are predisposed to criticise severely the religion

that condemns them. Men who are self-willed and disobedient to God sometimes blame him for their self-will and disobedience, and often declaim against the severity of his judgments. When we observe how difficult it is for workmen to see with the eyes of their employers, because both are controlled by self-interest, we can understand why sinners oppose God's government, and why we ourselves are liable to criticise unjustly the principles on which it is conducted. Against this we must be on our guard.

V. Qualifications for the Study of Christian Theology

1. *Mental:* soundness of judgment and power of systematic thinking. Good sense rather than genius is needed in the study of theology. For the questions to be answered are numerous and difficult; the evidence to be weighed is manifold and easily perverted, and a mistake at one point is sure to bring in darkness or error at other points.

2. *Moral:* fairness of mind and deep reverence for truth. Candor, though not indifference, is attainable. Prejudice can be laid aside, and docility cultivated. Augustine says:

"It will not grieve me to seek when I am in doubt, nor will it make me blush to learn when I am in error. Whoever reads these studies, where he is equally certain, let him go with me; where he is equally in doubt, let him inquire with me; where he discovers his own error, let him return to me; where he discovers mine, let him recall me. Thus let us walk in the way of love, tending towards Him of whom it is said, Seek ye his face always (Ps. 104, 4)."[1]

3. *Religious:* faith, love, humility. The importance

[1] "De Trinitate," L. I, c. 2 *ad finem* and c. 3 *ad initum.*

of these fruits of the spirit is admitted by all true theologians. "We must love divine things in order to know them." Yet it is equally true that we must know them in order to love them. Some knowledge is prerequisite to love; but love is prerequisite to the purest knowledge. God is love; how then can he be known by one who does not know what love is? God is holy; how then can he be appreciated by one who is sinful? Yet even natural affection and conscience are sufficient to afford some clue to the goodness and holiness of God, though much more is needed by one who undertakes the study of Christian Theology.

4. *Educational:* biblical, historical, scientific, and philosophical knowledge. All the sources of knowledge respecting God and man should be consulted, as far as possible, by the student of Christian Theology. But a mastery of the biblical sources is more useful than any thing else.

VI. Benefits of Studying Christian Theology

1. *Mental.* The mind was made for the apprehension of truth as evidently as the lungs were made for the reception of air. And the higher and purer the truth, the better will be its influence on the mind. Moreover, related truths belong to a system; they stand together and support one another. Hence a knowledge of their connection and interdependence is sought by the mind.

2. *Moral.* The study of Christian Theology should purify and protect the conscience. For the truths of Christianity are sacred. And it is self-evident that, in order to teach them faithfully and effectively, without doing violence to reason or conscience, one must study them thoroughly, with the best helps in his reach. Then, and only then, can he be reasonably sure that he understands the message which he is anxious to deliver. Hu-

man schools and teachers are not indispensable to this, but long and thorough study is; and this study can be most rapidly accomplished in good schools.

3. *Religious.* Some of the doctrines which claim the attention of a theological student are fitted to test his faith. If he bears the testing a great blessing follows. "Light is sown for the righteous." Christian knowledge is favorable to deep piety. Ignorance is the mother of superstition, not of devotion. The study of Christian Theology ought to be prosecuted in such a spirit as to make it a constant means of grace.

4. *Practical.* A minister's success is equal to the balance of good over evil in his influence, whether that influence is direct or indirect, immediate or remote. Hence less influence, altogether good, may be more valuable than greater influence, counterbalanced by much evil. A physician whose medicines should cure a hundred men and kill fifty, would be less useful than a physician whose medicines should cure sixty men and injure none. So a little pure truth may be more useful than a great deal of truth mingled with error. And one who has closely examined the principles of Christian truth, and has discovered their mutual relations and interdependence, will be less likely to fall into contradiction and exaggeration in preaching them, than one who has never made this preparation for his work.

VII. Divisions of Christian Theology

1. *Method of Treatment in this Course:*

PART FIRST

God, in Nature and in Scripture

PART SECOND

Mankind, their Nature, Character and Condition

PART THIRD

JESUS CHRIST, HIS PERSON AND WORK

PART FOURTH

CHRISTIAN LIFE, ITS BEGINNING AND GROWTH

PART FIFTH

CHRISTIAN SERVICE

PART SIXTH

ISSUES HEREAFTER

The scheme thus outlined has been commonly called synthetic. It takes the revealed facts and puts them together in logical order, so that their relations to one another are readily perceived. It avoids, as far as possible, any assumption as to the relative importance of Christian doctrines, yet on the whole, may be characterized as theocentric, starting from God and returning to God.

2. *Other Methods of Treatment*

(1) One of these is based on the *Trinity,* and the principal divisions are, God the Father as Creator, God the Son as Redeemer, and God the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier. The baptismal formula and the early creeds may have suggested this analysis, and it is in many respects satisfactory, but it gives no sufficient place to anthropology. If the only aim of Christian Theology were to discover the nature of God, and what he has done in the past or will do in the future, this analysis of religious truth would leave nothing to be desired.

(2) Another scheme is properly called *Christocentric.* It aims to bring all parts of Christian Theology under two heads, the Person and the Work of Christ. Thus

the person of Christ is said to reveal the true nature of God and of man, and, by contrast, the fallen state of man as he now lives; his work in providing for the renewal and forgiveness of man presupposes man's sinfulness and need of divine help; and both his teaching and resurrection make known the essential features of life after death. Andrew Fuller proposed to follow this plan in expounding the doctrines of Christian Theology; and Thomasius (G.) wrote an able work, entitled, "Christi Person und Werk" in accordance with it. But this scheme tends to subordinate unduly the work of the Father and of the Holy Spirit to that of Christ.

(3) Another scheme makes the *Kingdom of God* the central and regulative thought; thus, I. God, the King; II. Man, the Subject; III. Christ, the Founder of the Kingdom; IV. Redemption, the Character of the Kingdom; V. The Way of Salvation, the Law of the Kingdom; VI. The Church, its Training School; VII. The Completion of the Kingdom.[1] The most obvious objection to this scheme is the prominence which it gives to the governmental relation of God to men. God is certainly represented by Jesus Christ as a King, but he is represented no less distinctly as a Father. Christians are his servants, but no less truly his children.

(4) Another scheme makes *Reconciliation* to God through Christ the regulative thought. Thus Hase, in his "Hutterus Redivivus," speaks I. Of the Sources of Christian Theology, viz., the Bible (and Nature); II. Of its Object, viz., God; III. Of its Subject, viz., Man; IV. Of its Means, viz., Christ and his Work; V. Of the Result, viz., Reconciliation. Not very different from this is the scheme of Dr. Chalmers whose fundamental idea is, that Christianity is a *Remedial Dispensation.* Theology is an exposition of the disease and its remedy,

[1] See Van Osterzee's "Christian Dogmatics" from which this analysis is copied, and Augustine's "De Civitate Dei."

or of sin and its cure. He begins therefore with a study of the disease, and then proceeds to investigate the remedy.

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

Baptist

Gill (John), "A Complete Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity." (High Calvinism.) *Strong* (A. H.), "Systematic Theology. A Compendium and Commonplace Book." 1886. (Well analyzed and comprehensive.) *Boyce* (J. P.), "Abstract of Systematic Theology." 1887, Revised Edition, 1899. (Calvinistic, vigorous, thorough.) *Johnson* (E. H.), "Outline of Systematic Theology." 1891. (Clear, independent, excellent.) *Robinson* (E. G.), "Christian Theology." 1894. Edited by Prof. B. D. True of Rochester, N. Y. (Masculine.) *Clarke* (W. N.), "Outline of Christian Theology." 1894. (Exceedingly readable and stimulating.) *Dagg* (J. L.), "Manual of Theology and of Church Polity."

Presbyterian

Calvin (John), "Institutes of the Christian Religion." 2 vols. Trs. by Henry Beveridge. (A standard work.) Turretini (F.), "Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ." 4 vols. New Edition, Edinburgh, 1847-48. (Out of print.) *Hodge* (C.), "Systematic Theology." 3 vols. 1871. (Logical, historical, controversial.) *Smith* (H. B.), "System of Christian Theology." 1884. (Clear, scholarly, mediating.) *Shedd* (W. G. T.), "Dogmatic Theology." 3 vols. 1888. (Sturdy, thorough, realistic.) *Gerhart* (E. V.), "Institutes of the Christian Religion." 2 vols. 1891, 1894. (Dutch Reformed.)

Congregationalist

Wardlaw (R), "Systematic Theology." 1856. (Moderately Calvinistic.) *Wood* (Leonard), "Theological Lectures." 5 vols. 1849, 1850. (Sober, cautious, solid.) *Bellamy* (J.), "True Religion Delineated,"; "The Wisdom of God in the Permission of Evil." *Emmons* (N.), "Works," with a Memoir by Dr. Edwards A. Park. 6 vols. 1860-61. (Clear, strenuous, original: All virtue is in action: "The Exercise Scheme," as opposed to Dr. Asa Burton's "Taste Scheme.")

Lutheran

Dorner (A.), "System of Christian Doctrine." Eng. Trans. 4 vols. 1880-82. (Learned, profound, exhaustive.) *Philippi* (F. A.), "Kirchliche Glaubenslehre." 1854-1882. 6 vols. (Admirable analysis and discussion.) *Kahnis* (K. F. A.), "Die lutherische Dogmatik historisch-genetisch dargestellt." 2nd Ed. 2 vols. 1874-75. *Thomasius* (G.), "Christi Person und Werk." 4 vols. (Christocentric, kenotic.)

PART FIRST

GOD IN NATURE AND IN SCRIPTURE

PART FIRST

GOD IN NATURE AND IN SCRIPTURE

The word God is here used to signify a Supreme Being or Personality. Without belief in such a Being, true religion is impossible. There may be in the hearts of men a fear of blind force, but a life of cordial service can be given to nothing less than a personal and holy being, who is at the same time supreme.

But are there rational grounds for belief in the existence of such a being? We are confident that there are, and that they may be found in Nature and in Scripture. It is therefore expedient to begin our course of Study in Christian theology with a patient scrutiny of Nature and of the Holy Scriptures in search of the evidence which they furnish of the being of God.

CHAPTER I

GOD REVEALED IN NATURE

I. Trustworthiness of Nature's Teaching

1. No one will be likely to deny this, if he rightly interprets the word nature. For this term is used to connote the whole universe of matter and of mind, with the exception of God. All the worlds and all the living beings that people them, including the human race, are denoted by this single term. Nature is therefore the source of all scientific knowledge, and idealists, as well as naturalists, appeal to it with confidence in support of their views. What it teaches they consider themselves bound to believe.

2. But Nature is vast and mysterious. No man comprehends it perfectly. Moreover, as Sir James W. Dawson affirms, "it is in a state of constant movement and progress . . . always becoming something different from what it was, and man is placed in the midst of this orderly, law-regulated yet ever-progressive system, and is himself a part of it."

3. Since all parts of Nature are interdependent, it may seem necessary to examine the whole of it in order to obtain a correct view of its testimony concerning theism. But to do this is beyond our power. We must therefore be satisfied with knowing it in part. And if we maintain that this partial revelation is trustworthy, we do not mean to say that a mere fragment of nature is always intelligible when studied by itself alone. Neither the poison of asps nor a 'flower in the crannied wall,' is equal to the universe

as a source of instruction concerning God. But there may be principles and forces pervading Nature which are partially revealed in a thousand beings and things. Above all, man, a personal and moral being, is embraced in the complex order and system of Nature, and in the light of what man is, the truth of theism will appear to be profoundly reasonable and therefore credible.

II. Content of this Revelation

There are three hypotheses about Nature which merit examination; viz., the *Materialistic*, the *Idealistic*, and the *Theistic;* but the third is more reasonable than either the first or the second. This we shall attempt to show by a concise review of them.

We assume the existence of what we call nature or the universe, and infer that something must have been in existence always. Either the universe itself or an adequate cause of the universe must have been self-existent and eternal. It is impossible for the mind to believe that real being has come from nothing. We can conceive of eternal, that is, self-existent being, and we can conceive of one being as derived from another, but the emergence of something from nothing is altogether inconceivable. The laws of thought compel us to say, something is, and by that token we know that something has always been.

The materialistic hypothesis need not detain us long.[1] It has had able defenders, but its influence is waning. 1. It asserts that "matter, or material force is eternal, and has originated all mind or mental force."

[1] See *Lange* (F. A.), "History of Materialism"; translated from the German by Mr. Thomas, 3 vols.; *Büchner* (F. K. C. L.), "Matter and Force" and "Man's Place in Nature"; *Hæckel* (E. H.), "Natural History of Creation" and "Anthropogeny"; *Flint* (R.), "Antitheistic Theories" (Sections II and IV, and Notes V and XIX on the same); *Fiske* (J.), "Through Nature to God" (clear and strong).

But against this hypothesis it may be confidently affirmed that the reality of matter is less certain than the reality of mind; that it is more rational to consider matter an ideal or real product of mind than to consider thought or mind a secretion from matter, *i. e.*, from the brain; and that it is impossible to conceive of either of these as passing into the other by a change of nature. A tremor of the brain cannot be changed into a thought.

2. To meet this difficulty it has been argued that the one eternal Reality is two-sided; on the one, mental, and on the other, physical. This is supposed to be true of the simplest elements of nature, the ultimate atoms which have, either consciously or unconsciously, slowly built the worlds, with all that is in them.

3. *Objections.* But against this hypothesis we remark: (1) That it is a virtual surrender of materialism; for it gives as high a place to mind as to matter in the structure of the universe. (2) That there is no evidence of life in the ultimate particles of matter, and no evidence of intelligence in anything lifeless. (3) That to assign to each particular atom infinitesimal intelligence does not account for the order of the universe. (4) That to imagine every atom possessed of a far-seeing and coöperating intelligence is to set at nought experience and build one's castle in the air. Sir Wm. Thomson estimates that from six to sixty billions of chemical atoms are required to fill a *cubic inch* of space. Yet these atoms are exceedingly heavy. By a series of experiments upon the absorption of X and cathode rays, Signor Guglielmo has reached the conclusion that "the density of atoms is . . . 80,000,000 times that of water, or that atoms weigh about 28,000,000 pounds per cubic inch!" (*Current Literature,* Discoveries, Oct. 1899.)

Professor Royce thus felicitously describes the theory rejected by himself of a basal atomic intelligence: "An

atom in motion may be a thought, or, if that be saying far too much of so simple a thing, an atom in motion may be endowed with an infinitesimal consciousness. Billions of atoms in interaction may have as their resultant quite a respectable little consciousness. Sufficiently complex groups of Mind-Stuff . . . might produce a great man."[1] How the consciousness of each of these atoms is to be blended in one with billions of other consciousnesses, is not explained, nor can we imagine. Besides, the proper notion of materialism disappears when chemical atoms are assumed to be conscious, that is, intelligent, to be thoughts.

2. *Idealistic Monism* has better support in reason, but is nevertheless unsatisfactory.[2] This hypothesis denies the reality of matter. Of all natural and temporal existences it holds "that presence to consciousness constitutes their entire reality and entire existence."[3]

(1) *Arguments in favor criticised.* In commendation of this hypothesis the following may be said: —

a. It appears to satisfy the tendency of human reason to resolve all things into one. Thought reaches its goal, as well as its limit, when it finds that all are one in es-

[1] "The Religious Aspect of Philosophy," p. 254.

[2] *Schurman* (J. G.), "Belief in God"; *Hill* (D. J.), "Genetic Philosophy"; *Bowne* (B. P.), "Metaphysics"; *Lotze* (H.), "Microcosmus," transl. vol. II, b. ix., *Royce* (J.), "The Religious Aspect of Philosophy"; "The Conception of God"; "Studies of Good and Evil," I, IV-VIII; *Upton,* "The Bases of Religious Faith," pp. 278-364; *Le Conte* (G.), "Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection"; *Plumptre* (C. E.), "General Sketch of the History of Pantheism"; *Romanes* (G. J.), "Mind and Motion and Monism"; *Driesenberg* (U.), "Theismus und Pantheismus"; *Hovey* (A.), "Studies in Ethics and Religion"; *Strong* (A. H.), "Ethical Monism"; *Haeckel* (E.), "Monism as Connecting Religion and Science. The Confession of Faith of a Man of Science," 1894.

[3] Prof. Howison in Royce, "Conception of God," p. 84.

sence. Synthesis has nothing more to do. The logical faculty rests forever in absolute oneness.

But this argument is far from conclusive. For neither absolute simplicity nor discordant variety is the goal of rational thought. Unity in diversity is rather that goal, especially if the word 'soul' be substituted for the word 'thought,' if feeling, imagination, desire and will are associated with logical reasoning as functions of personal life.

b. This hypothesis dismisses the miracle of creation as needless and incomprehensible. Since reason seeks to comprehend all things, it welcomes with satisfaction a view which accounts for the world without any act of creation. This is probably the most effective argument for pantheism as well as for idealism. Its defenders assert that any addition to the sum of being is inconceivable, since such an addition would involve a production of something out of nothing.

But there is reason to question the soundness of this argument. If it is valid within the domain of material things, there is apparent ground for denying its applicability to the procreation of life and spirit, and, still more, its applicability to the action of an original, self-existent spirit. Consider the multiplication of animal life in ten thousand lives through uncounted generations. Consider the procreation of human souls in the human race, *i. e.*, if children are the offspring of their parents, according to the traducian theory. For the souls of children are personally distinct from the souls of their parents. Do we know that a spiritual power is lessened by any output of energy or force? And if it should appear that this is true of a finite spirit, must it be true also of an infinite spirit? *Heus, caute in istis agas!*

c. This hypothesis renders the reciprocal action between distinct beings or things intelligible. Lotze affirms, and Schurman follows him, that "all which exists

is but One Infinite Being which stamps upon individual things in fitting forms its own ever-similar and self-identical nature. Only on the assumption of this substantial unity is that intelligible which we call the reciprocal action of different things, and which in truth is always the reciprocal action of the states of one and the same thing." [1]

But we are unable to see anything absurd or incredible in the assumption that things differing from each other in some degree as to the substance of their being may have enough in common to make action and reaction possible. Why must the underlying essence of things be identical, any more than the states of that essence, in order to reciprocal action?

d. This hypothesis is favored by biological science. Biology is thought to furnish the best analogies for the explanation of the universe. For there is energy in a living being, and at the same time a relation of part to part throughout. Interaction between all the parts is also constant. The invisible force and the visible manifestation are inseparably united; so it must be with God and the universe. He is the soul, it is the organism in which he acts.

This argument for spiritual monism is scarcely tenable. The universe, including God, may indeed be compared with a great animal; but, as far as we can judge, the points of similarity are less numerous and less important than the points of difference. Why appeal to the one, and overlook the other?

e. This hypothesis is favored by certain passages of Scripture. "In him we live and move and are," Acts 17:28; "That God may be all in all," 1. Cor. 15:28. "Who is over all, and through all, and in all," Eph. 4:6.

But a careful scrutiny of the connection in which these expressions stand leads to a different view of their mean-

[1] Microcosm," vol. II, l. ix, pp. 660-1.

ing. Any one who believes that God is the omnipresent Maker and Upholder of the Universe finds it easy to explain such language. A literal interpretation of the *first* passage proves no more than this, that God's relation to us is as intimate as that of the atmosphere, for in the latter we live and move and are. If we give to the words any profounder meaning, it must be because of what we know of the Divine nature from other sources. The *second* passage obviously implies that God is not now what he purposes to be in relation to mankind or the universe. But it is unreasonable to suppose that Paul was thinking of essential monism or oneness of being. He was thinking of moral relations, of the place which God would fill in the hearts of mankind, or at least in their reverence. From the *last* passage we can only learn that God is the omnipresent and supreme Ruler. Some have found in a doubtful reading of John 1 : 3, 4, evidence that all things are life in the higher nature of Christ; but the interpretation, as well as the reading, is improbable.

Thus the arguments by which monism is recommended are inconclusive.

(2) *Objections to Monism.* And while this is so, there are considerations, deserving notice, which bear against it.

a. Energy of spirit is not convertible into physical energy. If it seems in any degree probable that the seventy or more ultimate forms of matter can be reduced to one, and that that one is nothing but elementary force, simple, continuous, undifferentiated, it does not seem probable that such a force is conscious and voluntary, that it is will-force. For an impossible gulf separates matter from mind, volition from gravitation. Gravitation has no initiative, no power of choice, while volition is nothing, unless it be initiative. We do not deny a

possible connection between the two, matter and mind, but it is an absolutely incomprehensible connection. The conscious will, if changed into physical force, would be no longer itself; but there is no evidence in physical science, or mental, that such a change is possible.

Says Professor Fiske: "Thought and feeling which can neither be weighed nor measured, do not admit of being resolved into modes of action. They do not enter into the closed circuit of physical transformations, but stand forever outside of it, and concentric with that segment of the circuit which passes through the brain. It may be that thought and feeling could not continue to exist if that physical segment of the circle were taken away. It may be that they could. To assume that they could not is surely the height of rash presumption. The correlation of forces exhibits mind as in no wise a product of matter, but as something in its growth and manifestations outside and parallel."[1]

b. Monism appears to be incompatible with human causality or freedom. For it resolves all power into God's power and all action into God's action. He is immanent in nature, and every part of nature is immanent in him. All forms of natural energy are his actions. How then can man be responsible for his own volitions? Consciousness affirms that he is, but a monistic view of God denies this truth on the ground that God is all in all. Man may seem to act, but it is God who really acts through man's action.

c. Monism refutes itself by rejecting the testimony of consciousness. For while it rests on the testimony of consciousness in proving will to be the only known source of action, it rejects the testimony of consciousness by ascribing its voluntary energy to God. If human consciousness does not prove that human will has real energy, it surely does not prove that any other will has such energy. For in acting it is directly cognizant of itself

[1] "Through Nature to God," p. 155.

alone as the actor. It does not even know that its volitions are translated into muscular energies; it only knows that nervous or muscular energy is elicited or set free by its volition. It is said that all physical energy is resolvable into motion; but it has not been shown that thought is resolvable into motion, and even physical energy must be the motion of something that moves.

3. *The Theistic hypothesis is reasonable.*[1] This hypothesis, which affirms the existence of a Supreme Being, personal, wise, and good, the Creator and Sustainer of all other beings, satisfies best of all the entire spiritual nature of man. Yet most of the evidence on which it rests is probable, rather than demonstrative. It may therefore be discredited by one who is unwilling to believe in God. Some parts of it suffer from our ignorance of Nature in its vast extent; for although it is right to presume that a partial knowledge of the universe points to the same conclusions which a full knowledge of it would authorize, we cannot be absolutely certain of this. "We know in part," and it is at least possible that the remote parts and periods of the universe are less homogeneous and uniform than the phenomena of earth suggest.

There are two characteristics of Nature which find their best explanation in the being of a personal God.

(1) One of these is *the prevalence of order in the universe.* This branch of the theistic argument has been

[1] *Harris* (S.), "The Philosophical Basis of Theism," 1883; "The Self-Revelation of God," 1887; "God the Creator and Lord of All," 1896; *Morris* (J.), "A New Natural Theology Based on the Doctrine of Evolution" (thorough, not easy); *Fisher* (G. P.), "The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief," 1883 (brief, but to the point); *Flint* (R.), "Theism," 5th ed., 1886; "Anti-Theistic Theories," 2nd ed., 1880 (well digested); *Diman* (J. L.), "The Theistic Argument," 1881 (an admirable survey of the field); *Foster* (R. S.), "Theism," "Creation" (popular, readable, instructive); *Martineau* (J.), "Religion and Modern Materialism," 1878 (keen and sagacious).

called Eutaxiology. "I believe," writes Prof. J. P. Cooke, of Harvard College, in his instructive volume on the Religion of Chemistry, "that all parts of nature are correlated by laws, and that the wider our knowledge becomes the more universal these laws will appear."

And Prof. Samuel Harris, in his "Philosophical Basis of Theism," says, "If it is legitimate for Spencer and Tyndall to affirm that the Absolute Being is a power, because it is the ultimate ground of the power manifested in the universe, it is equally legitimate to affirm that the Absolute Being is a rational power, because it is the ultimate ground of the rational power manifested in the universe" (p. 76).

Such order as we observe in nature is what might be expected from the action of a Supreme Mind, since all that is known of mind leads us to think of it as able and likely to produce a Cosmos, if it produced a world at all. Furthermore, such order as prevails in nature cannot be rationally ascribed to the properties of matter. For matter is not known to think or foresee or plan. It is unconscious and without freedom, ejecting its force with no self-chosen reference to order, beauty or moral worth.[1]

(2) A second characteristic of Nature is *marks of design* in the structure of its parts. This branch of the theistic argument has been called Teleology. Socrates made use of it, regarding all the organs of sense as adapted to the external world. He called attention to the delicacy and sensitiveness of the eye as an organ most useful to living beings and most skillfully guarded by the eyelids, the eyebrows, and the eyelashes.

The Bridgewater Treatises elaborate this argument in many directions with great learning. The principle of the argument is thus stated by Dr. Thomas Hill,[2]

[1] Compare Dawson (J. W.), "Modern Ideas of Evolution," p. 188-9.

[2] In the *Unitarian Review,* 1885, p. 411.

"When an organ is found effecting a result, the presumption is that it was created in order to effect that result; and this presumption is strengthened in the compound ratio of the complication of the organ, the efficacy of its action, the value of the result, and our inability to see other uses for the organ, or better means of effecting the result; the presumption being thus readily raised to a moral certainty."

Of course the creation of the organ may have been effected either directly or indirectly, either by one act or by a thousand acts. Evolution is neither affirmed nor denied by President Hill, or by the argument from design when properly stated. And the argument would lose nothing in cogency, if it were assumed that the adaptation of the organ and its environment were mutual with reference to the end sought. Design, purpose, finality is the essential matter in this argument; if nature animate or inanimate gives signs of it, it must have been formed or controlled by mind. The parts of the universe accessible to human observation are related to one another in an intelligible manner; we live in an intelligible universe; and this fact can only be explained by referring it to the action of a Supreme Mind.

Objections. But against this conclusion have been urged the facts:

a. That some parts of living beings appear to be useless.

In reply to this criticism of the argument from order and design in Nature, it may be remarked, first, that there are very few, if any, parts of animals which can be safely pronounced useless. It may be premature to affirm that there are any. For, in addition to preserving and transmitting life, the structure of animals may be intended to serve an educational purpose, by showing their derivation from an inferior ancestry, or from an ancestry living in very different circumstances. In such instances the parts supposed to be useless are illustrations

of law and order in the evolution of animal life and are therefore in a high degree serviceable to man. They were once useful in preserving life; they are now useful as records of the past.

b. That some forces of nature appear to do more harm than good. Such things are best explained by supposing the universe to be the result of interaction between blind or unconscious forces.

In reply to the second item of this criticism it may also be remarked, that forces commonly destructive may, nevertheless, be needed and useful. Famines, pestilences, earthquakes, cyclones, conflagrations, and poisons are among these. There is "a soul of goodness" in them. They teach important truths, and cultivate holy and heroic tempers. Bad as the moral conduct of man is, it would certainly be much worse if all the forces of nature were harmless, and the burdens and perils of life were removed. Destructive forces must therefore be studied as parts of an educational system, established for high natural and spiritual ends not otherwise attainable. Arrival and surrival of the fittest may necessitate evil in the making.

4. *The Genetic History of Nature Theistic.* But this allusion to the modern doctrine of evolution brings before us the question, Cannot the existing forces and processes and forms of nature be rationally accounted for without referring them to the action of an intelligent being? Are we not led back step by step in the paths of science from human life to animal life, from animal life to vegetable life, from vegetable life to chemical combinations, from aggregated chemical combinations to planets, and then nebulæ, and from nebulæ to fire-mist? Is it not safe to assume that the original fire-mist had in itself "the promise and potency" of all that has since appeared in the universe?

These questions presuppose several stages in the genetic history of nature, and lead us to inspect those stages seriatim, but especially the transitions from one stage or stratum to another. For it is easier to imagine a certain degree of progress in forms of being once established, than to imagine a change *per saltum* from one form of being to an apparently heterogeneous and distinctly higher form.

(1) The first step of advance from fire-mist to the present forms of existence in nature must have been, it is said, *the production of atoms.* Atoms are ultimate and irreducible units. No available amount of heat is able to make any change in them, and matter in the present order of nature has for one of its conditions the indestructibility of atoms. But there are more than seventy kinds of atoms, and the properties of each one of them differ from the properties of every other. These atoms are sometimes supposed to be centres of force, and sometimes, vortex rings. But no microscope is powerful enough to render them visible. They are infinitesimal in size. But they are now thought to be secondary forms of matter, derived from an original, homogeneous substance. "The atoms were born." In them "the energies of the universe were manifested" (Morris). And they were so manifested as to produce elements suited to act and react upon one another, forming molecules, and masses, suns and planets. Hence the atoms must have been made for a purpose. The energies of the homogeneous substance operated in an intelligent manner: that substance must therefore have been intelligent itself, or it must have been set in motion by intelligence. If not, we have in the effect something wholly wanting in the cause, which is scarcely credible.

(2) Another step in advance was made by the appearance of *vegetable life on earth.* Nutrition distinguishes the living substance from the mineral. The

crystal attracts to itself only molecules possessing its own chemical composition, the protoplasm absorbs substances of variable composition, decomposes them, assimilates some of their parts and rejects others.[1] The properties of living matter are, first, a peculiar chemical constitution; second, waste by oxydation; third, growth by appropriating fresh material within; fourth, tendency to cyclical change and reproduction; and fifth, dependence on moisture and heat.

Palæontology teaches that undifferentiated matter, atoms, molecules, masses, suns, and planets, with surfaces of reduced temperature, preceded the existence of vegetables. Prof. Huxley has admitted that no form of life known to man could have existed in the cosmic vapor. And it is equally certain that no form of life known to man can exist in the sun. Moisture and moderate temperature are conditions of vegetable life. The utmost extremes of heat and cold are barriers to the existence of living organisms, whether simple or complex.

But how were vegetables originated? To this we answer, with our present light: a. Not by the unassisted properties of matter. For no living organism is born of lifeless matter. "Life from life" is a universal fact. Inert matter does not lift itself into the realm of life. After long and skilful experimentation Prof. Tyndall found it impossible to obtain life from anything lifeless. But b. by the energy or action of God. In him we find a *Vera Causa* for so wonderful a force, for an energy without weight, an energy which controls and coördinates chemical elements, without being itself a chemical element.

If the cosmos was originated by a Supreme Mind, we can account for the origin of vegetable life, and for its origin at the first opportune moment. At the very hour when all things were ready, the higher principle, in the

[1] Perrier.

form of protoplasm or of plant, would naturally be introduced by this Mind, and the marvelous world of plant life would be started on its great career of blessing and of beauty.

(3) A further step in advance was made by the appearance of *animal life on the earth.* The transition from vegetable to animal life is obscure, and the line of separation between the one and the other faint. Yet they are distinguishable at the following points.

a. Animals of every kind are nourished by food produced by living organisms, while vegetables are nourished by inorganic matter. This is a most important difference.

Says Prof. Asa Gray:

"Plants only are nourished upon mineral matter and upon earth and air. It is their peculiar office to appropriate mineral materials and organize them into a structure in which life is manifested... Animals appropriate and live upon organic matter, but have not the power of producing it."[1]

b. Animal life affords proof of conscious feeling, if not of consecutive thought. Note the impassable gulf which separates the elephant, the horse, the dog, the ape, the carrier pigeon, or the eagle, from the oak, the vine, the maple or the cedar. c. Animal life has powers of locomotion distinguishing it from vegetable life. Its movements are more like those of men. They are self-directed and evidently conscious.

Thus in food, in sensibility, in knowledge, and in locomotion, the animal is far superior to the plant; and whether we reason from the principle of a sufficient cause, or from the observed law of heredity, we shall find the derivation of animals from plants alone exceedingly improbable.

[1] Compare Morris, "A New Natural Theology," etc., p. 117.

The two facts, that animals are dependent on living organisms for food while vegetables are not, and that animals are a distinctly higher order of beings than vegetables, favor the hypothesis that vegetable life preceded animal life on this planet. Yet it is conceivable that both appeared at the same time, though it is not credible that animal life antedated vegetable life. The order of change in nature has been from the simpler to the more complex, from the lower to the higher forms of being; and the higher forms depend upon the lower much more than do the lower upon the higher.

Objections to this View

But the defenders of merely natural evolution object to theism (1), because multitudes of animals perish prematurely, *i. e.,* without completing the cycle of growth, decay, and death for which they seem to be fitted. For this fact militates against the supposition that a wise being originated them. Such a being would have postponed his originative action until a perfect environment had been provided for them.

In reply to this we remark: a. That a wise Creator may be rationally conceived to have placed living beings in an environment imperfectly adapted to them, provided it was so well adapted to them that multitudes would grow up to maturity though other multitudes would perish prematurely with but little suffering. b. It is possible that no environment could, in the nature of the case, be perfectly adapted to every one of a great variety of species, though it could be partially adapted to all, and would therefore be able to support more animals in the aggregate than it could support of any single species, to which it might have been perfectly adapted.

Theism is objected to, (2), because many races of animals *live by destroying other animals for food.* Land

and sea swarm with carnivorous beings, and the strong constantly devour the weak. Hundreds of species have been destroyed in this way.

We reply, a., that a vastly greater amount of animal life exists on earth than would be possible if animals did not devour one another. The air swarms with insects, the water is full of living things, the flowers of the desert are astir with myriads of tiny creatures. And b. that a sudden and early death is probably attended with little pain in the case of irrational beings. They do not look forward to death as an evil, and they have no anticipations of a future life.

Theism is objected to, (3), because *useless organs,* or *remains of organs,* are found in many animals, a fact which is inconsistent with the hypothesis that animals owe their existence to an intelligent being, but consistent with the hypothesis that they are products of natural evolution.

We reply, that certain organs esteemed useless may be due, a., to a love of order, harmony, or symmetry existing in the Creator's mind, or, b., to a process of evolution by means of which the Creator is pleased to work, or, c., to the educational value of traces of past forms of life in revealing to men the ways of God, and making the universe intelligible to them.

(4) A still further step in advance was made by the appearance of *Mankind* on the earth. The interval between the lower animals and man is very wide. For man is a being at once *rational, moral,* and *religious;* and we must either suppose that he is the product of mere vital energies, acting without reason, or that germs of reason, moral sense, and religion were latent in animal life, and still earlier in chemical atoms, or else that a Supreme Mind was concerned in the creation of mankind. It has been claimed "that the life in man is a possession which he shares in common with the beast of the field — that the life which animates the world is but one existence

variously developed, sleeping in the plant, dreaming in the animal, waking in man" (Matheson). But this theory of life, however poetic, is supported by no evidence. It is a fancy against which we are no more called to argue than we are to weigh a shadow. We are bound to deal with the solid facts pertaining to animals and men, facts which show how much they have in common and how much they differ; and then to decide whether men are, or are not, derived wholly from animals, without the intervention of a higher power.

(1) *Mankind are rational beings.* Let us compare human intelligence with animal intelligence, observing:

a. That *the size of the human brain,* the immediate organ of thought, is so much greater than that of any animal brain as to discredit a merely natural evolution of the one from the other.

b. That *human language* differentiates men from animals even more distinctly than the greater size of their brain. The flexibility, compass, and precision of human speech are amazing, and these qualities reveal the vast capacity of the mind which employs them.

c. That *the hand of man* distinguishes him greatly from the highest animals. It answers in a wonderful degree to the wide range of his mental powers. The well known Bridgewater treatise by Dr. Bell gives ample proof of this statement, and is worthy of careful perusal.

d. That *the constructive art of man* is vastly superior to that of animals, showing that both cannot belong to the same order of life. The former is free, progressive, and almost unlimited in range, while the latter is chiefly inherited and always limited in range.

e. That *human appreciation of the sublime and beautiful* is wanting in animals. A great mountain or cataract fills the soul of man with wonder and awe; a beautiful landscape or flower fills it with pleasure; but there

is no evidence that a dog or an elephant is thus affected by either.

f. That *the power of imagination* differentiates human intelligence from that of mere animals. The products of human imagination in architecture, in sculpture, in literature, in music, in poetry, in painting, in mechanical invention, and in pure geometry, are endlessly varied and surprising. How much that is inspiring would be swept from the earth if all the works of this royal power were destroyed!

g. That human intelligence is able to form *general concepts,* while animal intelligence seems unable to do this. The former cognizes the properties and relations of things as well as the things themselves. It classifies facts and systematizes knowledge. But brutes are innocent of science and philosophy, the highest achievements of man.

h. That human intelligence not only perceives external objects, but *reflects upon its act of perception, upon its reflection on this act,* and indeed *upon all its mental action.* It is able to criticise its own work. It is conscious of two worlds, an outward and an inward, and can study the changes of one almost as readily as the changes of the other. This power of introspection does not reveal itself in brutes.

i. That human intelligence is characterized by *curiosity, aspiration,* and *endless progress,* while animal intelligence is distinguished for restfulness and content. The latter reaches the limits of growth early, the former never. Animal intelligence gives no sign of interest in anything beyond the range of experience through sensation, but human intelligence or reason seeks to explore the universe and look into eternity in quest of causes and motives.[1]

[1] See Dawson (J. W.), "Modern Ideas of Evolution," p. 196, "On the Nature of Instinct."

(2) Again, *mankind are moral beings,* and as such are separated widely from brutes — so widely, indeed, that we cannot believe them to have been the offspring of brutes by any process of merely natural development. The presence in men of a moral faculty which is wanting to the animal races, forbids the hypothesis of man's descent from any one of those races. That this faculty is wanting to mere animals has been generally admitted and never successfully disproved. We may therefore assume it to be true.

It may properly be added, a. that the consciousness of moral obligation involves belief in a Law outside of ourselves to which our conduct ought to be conformed; b. that with this consciousness of obligation and belief in a moral law above us is connected an instinctive and profound conviction that there is, back of that law, a "Power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness"; and c. that this Power cannot rationally be regarded as destitute of reason and moral character. It must be a Supreme Mind to whom all rational beings are accountable.

From the moral nature of man Immanuel Kant inferred the existence of God. This argument he pronounced absolutely trustworthy, although he rejected all the others then in use as unworthy of confidence. Sir Wm. Hamilton agreed with Kant in accepting this evidence of the existence of God as conclusive, but he associated with it the mental law by which motive precedes action as final causes precede efficient causes. By the normal action of conscience, therefore, God is revealed to the reason of man.[1]

(3) Still further, mankind are *religious beings,* and as such are yet more widely separated from brutes than they are by their rational and moral powers. The evidence for this proposition may be found in our own conscious-

[1] See Diman, "The Theistic Argument," pp. 248, 249.

ness, in the history of mankind, and in the universal practice of religious worship. Every glance at history, every survey of the world as it now is, and every look into the life of one's own soul reveals the presence of religious need and aspiration.

a. Man has a deep feeling of *dependence on a higher power.* Schleiermacher regards this feeling of dependence as the distinctively religious quality of human life. Dorner also assigns to this feeling an important place and function in true piety. Whoever, instead of struggling against it, welcomes it as a feeling in harmony with truth and freighted with peace, is one whose religious life must be flowing clear and strong towards the goal of perfection. And Dean Mansel has truly said:

> "With the first development of consciousness there grows up as part of it an innate feeling that our life, natural and spiritual, is not in our own power to sustain or prolong; that there is One above us on whom we are dependent, whose existence we learn and whose presence we realize by the instinct of prayer."[1]

b. Man has a vague but indestructible *sense of moral accountability.* This is often conceded by men who reject the authority of God; and a simple assertion of this truth, by one who thoroughly believes it, has wonderful power over the consciences of men. A majority of mankind who believe in the existence of a moral Ruler of the world, do this not because they have considered the arguments for his existence, but because they have a moral nature, a conscience, that somehow testifies of him. This is always to be remembered in studying the condition of the heathen.

c. Man has a *tendency* to worship some being distinct from himself and a certain longing for communion with that being. This appears in some members of every

[1] "Limits of Religious Thought," p. 120.

branch of the human family. The rude and the cultivated manifest the same tendency. They feel a need of God, and if they refuse to worship the true God, they are likely in the end to bow down with superstitious fear before a false god. If, like Comte, they deny the Lord that made them, their religious need is apt to avenge itself, by impelling them to worship the "creature [mankind] instead of the Creator."

d. We may also observe, that religion differs from morality, which it implies, by always having a *personal* object. If the moral law is traceable to God as its Source, it is in reality nothing more nor less than one revelation of a perfect and holy Mind, one expression of a true and loving Heart. And man, who is himself mind and heart, a person conscious of acting freely, with a view to rational ends, must look beyond the law to the Lawgiver, never finding rest until he comes to One whom he can love and honor, and with whom he can speak and commune. True religion is an attitude of mind to mind, of heart to heart, of person to person. The soul of man cries out for a living and personal God, and not for mere order or unconscious force. Amid the awful movements of the Universe, it lifts up its face to One who has an eye to see, an ear to hear, a heart to love; and finding Him, it rests and adores.

e. The religious nature of man seeks a *perfect* Being as the only satisfactory object of worship. We do not mean by this that every human being has in his mind the idea of an absolutely perfect Being; much less do we mean that every man who has this idea is full of reverence and devotion towards such a Being; but we mean that the soul of man has capacities and aspirations, either slumbering or awake, that will never be permanently satisfied with an imperfect object of worship; we mean that the nature of man will never find its true Sovereign and central Life until it finds the infinite God,

revealed, though dimly, to and by its deepest longings in its most lucid moments.

f. Since the nature of man requires *perfection* in the object of its worship, it is *reasonable to believe* that *God is perfect.* And it is only by considering and respecting this demand of man's spiritual nature that one can infer the absolute perfection of God from the things that he has made. For the created universe cannot be proved to be infinite; nor can a finite effect, considered merely as a product of energy, prove the existence of an infinite cause. But, starting with the truth that the Maker of all things has shown himself to be superlatively wise and powerful, it is irrational to think that he has endowed man with a religious nature adapted to the worship of any other being than himself, or needing for its eternal satisfaction any greater or better being than himself. It is from this point of view, — the spiritual nature of man, — that we obtain a sight of proof of the existence of such a God as is revealed by the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, a God of perfect wisdom and goodness. This argument is retrogressive, from effect to cause, as are all the preceding arguments.

To this extent is God revealed in Nature, and especially in the spirit of man. Had he made no other revelation of himself, it would have been possible for us to believe in him as personal, wise, and powerful beyond the highest reach of our comprehension. And this would make it our duty to serve him faithfully, though it would give us as transgressors no certain grounds for hope in his mercy.

But can we not go a step further before turning to the Scriptures for light? Is there not some logical process by which we can demonstrate the existence of an all-perfect Creator? We think not, though some of the ablest logicians have tried to show that there is.

5. *A priori arguments favorable to theism.*

(1) Among these were *Anselm* (d. April 21, 1109) whose argument reads thus: "God is something than which nothing greater can be thought . . . But that something than which nothing greater can be thought cannot be in the intellect only; for if it be in the intellect only, it can be thought to be in reality also — *which would be greater.*" This argument proves that our conception of the greatest being is the *conception* of a real being, but it does not prove that such a being really exists.

(2) *Samuel Clarke* (d. May 17, 1729) proposed the following: "Necessary ideas are true. The ideas of infinity and eternity are necessary. But infinity and eternity are attributes, not essences; they inhere in some being who is infinite and eternal, therefore in God." Plausible, but not conclusive, for we do not conceive of infinity and eternity as being necessarily attributes of real existence.

(3) *Cousin* (d. Jan. 13, 1867) says that "truth, beauty, and goodness are attributes; therefore absolute truth, beauty, and goodness must belong to an absolute being, *i. e.,* God." This is plausible but not demonstrative; for our conception of absolute truth, beauty, and goodness does not prove their real existence.

None of these arguments are logically conclusive. The most that can be said is, that the ideas of self-existence, infinity, eternity, and supreme perfection are natural to the human mind, and, perhaps, that the tendency to associate them with a living Being is strong. These two facts may suffice to establish a presumption of no little value in favor of the existence of God, but, if this is all, they belong to the same class as those previously examined, *i. e.,* to the class of *a posteriori* arguments. In spite of them one *can* doubt the existence of God, and this doubt is not, in the strictness of logic, an absurdity.

In the light of our study thus far, it must be admitted:

III. That the Revelation of God in Nature is Insufficient

If this revelation is looked upon as intended for the instruction of mankind in their present moral condition, it leaves many vital questions unanswered. Whether it would be found perfect by sinless and immortal beings, possessing a very high order of intelligence, may be doubtful; but 1. it certainly fails to make clear to sinful men the whole mind of God towards them. Its testimony as to Divine mercy and grace is apparently wavering. 2. It does not reveal the course which God will take with sinners hereafter. 3. It says nothing of Divine self-sacrifice. 4. It discloses nothing as to the inner life of God, and nothing quite satisfactory concerning the future life of man. We are ready therefore to welcome clearer light upon the Author of our being.

CHAPTER II

GOD REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE

THERE is reason for distinguishing the Bible from Nature as a source of theistic revelation. This reason is found in our belief that the sacred Scriptures are records of views of chosen men who were enlightened and guided in a supernatural way by the Spirit of God in doing their work as religious teachers. If all their illumination was strictly natural in its origin, their teaching as to the existence and will of God should be treated as a part of Nature's testimony, and accounted for as the action of reason and conscience in man. If not, we are face to face with a special movement of God for the recovery of man from sin and death, that is, with a method of revelation and grace which transcends in some degree the ordinary course of God in Nature.

But to this special form of revelation two general objections are strongly urged. 1. *In such a revelation God gives to some men earlier and better knowledge of himself than he gives to others.* This earlier and better knowledge is equivalent to a better opportunity for salvation, and therefore to more probability of being saved. But all ought to be treated alike. If God reveals himself directly to one human being, he can and should reveal himself in the same way to every such being. For all are entitled to equal advantages, especially of a moral and religious nature.

In reply to this objection to a written revelation, it should be said: —

(1) That the same objection may be urged against the

general "constitution and course of nature." Some men are born into more favorable conditions than others. The children of barbarism have less religious knowledge than the children of civilization. And this difference is due to conditions established indirectly, if not directly, by the Author of Nature. Is, then, a supernatural method of action on the part of God to be discredited, although it agrees with the natural method of his working which places some men for a time in better circumstances than others? We think not. Besides, the objection assumes that God is under obligation to give the same or equal capacities and opportunities to all moral beings, — an assumption which is contradicted by the whole history of mankind.

(2) That this objection undervalues the importance of moral responsibility in the formation of moral character. It puts everything upon God. It thinks of him as related to individuals who are dependent on him, but who are not thought of as free moral agents connected with him and also with one another. In reality, men are social beings, members of a family, and under obligation to serve one another. And as social life is nobler and richer than solitary life, so it brings with it more and greater responsibilities. The higher the good, the greater the price which must be paid for it. By virtue of his connection with mankind every human being is to a certain extent his brother's keeper. In order to train men as a race of moral beings, God must hold them to the duties which spring out of their connections with one another. He must treat them as a family, bound to live and to work together for the good of each and of all. And to do this, on any large scale, he must intrust the early training of children to their parents, and the higher instruction of the people in religion and morality to leaders whom he selects and qualifies for their arduous service. If this method of conveying truth through one person to others, whether

by voice or pen, fails to insure the equal enlightenment of all, it must be through the unfaithfulness of those who have received the truth and been charged with the duty of transmitting it, or else through the indifference or opposition of some of those to whom it is offered. The method is good, honoring the moral nature of man.

It is also objected, —

2. *That in making such a revelation God must act in an extraordinary,* i. e., *a supernatural manner, and such action is incredible.* Order is supreme and unbroken in the action of God, and any account of his deviating in the slightest degree from his usual method of working may be safely rejected as false.

To this objection one may reply: —

(1) That the action of God is presumably more like that of the human spirit than like that of physical force. For certain purposes, it must be regular; for other purposes it may be variable. It may deal in one way with lifeless matter, in another, with rational souls. If man, as we know, can act upon the energies of nature, and, by combining, dividing, or reinforcing them, secure unexpected results, God can surely do the same to a far greater extent.

(2) That supernatural action must be distinguished from unnatural or contra-natural action. Supernatural action is not, in the case supposed, hostile to universal order. It tends to restore harmony, — especially when the spiritual world is viewed in its connections with the natural world. If the tenor of a written revelation were opposed to the order which prevails in nature, or if the proper authentication of it could only have been made by divine action which was derogatory to the general order and manifest purpose of nature, the objection now urged would have weight. But neither of these suppositions is according to fact. The ratification which was given to the teaching of Christ and his apostles is described by

such terms as "wonders," "signs," "powers," "works that none but God can do," or "events that none but God can foreknow." But they were in no case slights upon the order of nature. They had no tendency to diminish one's confidence in the uniformity of natural laws as related to man and his welfare.

(3) On the other hand, there are good reasons for believing that such a revelation of God and his will as the Bible purports to furnish, is neither impossible, nor incredible, nor even improbable. It is not impossible, for the existence of a personal God, above nature and able to direct her forces into new channels, is surely possible. It is not incredible, for wise and sane men believe that it has been made. And it is not even improbable, for the existence of a personal God, willing to furnish the children of men with more knowledge of himself than they obtain from nature is surely probable. For if there is a God, it may be presumed that he is merciful; if there is a merciful God, it is not improbable that he would make a special revelation of his mercy to men whose minds are darkened by sin; and if there is a holy as well as merciful God, it is probable that this revelation would be given in such a form as would test and improve the moral character of those to whom it was made. The Holy Scriptures fulfil these conditions. We are therefore to investigate their claim to being a revelation of God, without feeling that there is, on the whole, any presumption against the truthfulness of that claim. In other words, a supernatural revelation, committed to writing, is not to be considered, before investigation, improbable.

But what steps must we take in order to answer the question, *Is the Bible a trustworthy revelation of God,* i. e., *of his being, his character, and his relation to other beings, especially to men?* We begin with a study of the New Testament writings as historical documents relating to Jesus Christ, to his disciples, and to their contempora-

ries, and, having satisfied ourselves as to their character and teaching, go back with them in our hands to a study of the Old Testament writings. Our first proposition is that:

THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES ARE TRUSTWORTHY AS HISTORICAL RECORDS.

The trustworthiness of primary historical records mainly depends on the opportunities which the writers had to learn the truth; on their powers of observation, memory and expression; on their desire to learn and to report the truth; on their number and essential agreement; and on the consistency of their testimony with experience in similar circumstances.

Applying these tests to the writers of the New Testament, we find, that their opportunities to learn the facts which they relate were ample. For:

1. *Christianity as a historical religion took its rise with the public ministry of Jesus of Nazareth, in Palestine, near the end of the third decade of our era.*

In support of this statement we remark that there are no traces whatever of the existence of this religion *before* the date mentioned, "near the end of the third decade of our era," A.D. 28-30; and that one hundred years *later*, A.D. 130, it had already spread itself over large provinces of the Roman Empire.[1]

Dr. Gieseler in the article referred to[2] concludes that

[1] See Pliny the Younger, Epist. X. 97, cf. X. 98; Tacitus, "Annals," XV, 44; Suetonius, "Vita Neronis," § 16, and "Vita Claudii," § 25; also Juvenal, "Sat.," I, 155, 157; Euseb., H. E., IV, 9; and Josephus, Ant., XVIII, iii, 3; and compare an article by Gieseler, in the "Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie," 1878, p. 86 sq. on the passage in "Josephus." A brief notice of "the data furnished by pagan literature" may be found in Dr. E. C. Mitchell's "Critical Handbook of the Greek New Testament," 2d ed., p. 20 sq.

[2] The passage is bracketed in Bekker's edition of "Josephus," though the reference to Jesus in Ant. XX, ix, 1, is treated as

the original form of Josephus' statement read as follows: "There appeared about this time, Jesus, a wise man, a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of the men who receive the truth with pleasure; and many of the Jews, but many also from the Greeks, he drew to himself. This one *was* [*called*] the Christ. And although Pilate, on the accusation of the best men among us had punished him with crucifixion, those who first loved him did not cease. And until now the race of Christians named from this one has not failed."

All the early Christian writers who speak of the matter agree in stating that Jesus Christ was crucified by order of Pontius Pilate, who was procurator of Judea from about A.D. 26 to A.D. 36. The appearance of Christianity as a historical religion may therefore be assigned with reasonable confidence to the thirtieth year of our era, and the public ministry of Jesus to the three or three and a half years preceding that date.

2. *The several books of the New Testament were written by immediate disciples, that is, pupils, of Jesus, or by some of their associates, before the close of the first century of our era.*[1]

genuine. This reference is no less valuable historically than the one which is bracketed. (Compare Gieseler's "Ecclesiastical History" (Am. Ed., H. B. Smith), Vol. I, p. 66; and Rawlinson's "Historical Evidences," Lecture VII.)

[1] Literature: *Westcott* (B. F.), "History of the Canon of the New Testament"; *Charteris* (A. H.), "Canonicity: A Collection of Early Testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament"; *Given* (J. J.), "The Truth of Scripture in Connection with Revelation, Inspiration, and the Canon"; *Davidson* (S.), "Canon of the Bible," 3d edition, 1880; *Tregelles* (S. P.), "Canon Muritorianus"; *Farrar* (F. W.), "The Messages of the Books"; *Mitchell* (E. C.), "Critical Handbook of the Greek New Testament," enlarged edition, 1896; *Credner* (K. A.), "Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canon"; *Reuss* (E.), "History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Church." Reuss is an able critic of the Kühner type.

(1) The apostle Paul, though not an immediate disciple of Jesus, was converted within a few years after his death, say from two to five, and was acquainted with some of his disciples. He had been educated in Jerusalem, had shared with the Pharisees in their enmity to Jesus, had engaged with them in persecuting the first Christians, had seen the risen Saviour, and had been convinced by revelation and study of the Messiahship of Jesus. Less than seven years had passed since Jesus began his ministry and less than five since Jesus had been publicly crucified, when he gave himself, heart and soul, to Christ. He was thoroughly intelligent and intensely conscientious. It is therefore incredible that he neglected to make himself familiar with the essential facts concerning Jesus. The most important of them seem to have been assured to him by revelation; others, pertaining to the outward circumstances of the Lord's life, may have been learned from the twelve. There is no reason to believe that he was indifferent to any part of the Saviour's ministry, or that he was misinformed as to the nature or object of that ministry.

(2) Thirteen epistles were attributed by the early Christians to Paul. They all purport to have been written by him. They belong to the class of writings undisputed in the time of Eusebius. They are found in the earliest versions of the New Testament. Two of them, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, were probably written in A.D. 52 or 53; four of them, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, in A.D. 57 or 58; four of them, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Philemon, in A.D. 61 or 62; and three of them, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, about A.D. 66 or 67. The second group, consisting of four epistles, has been received by the principal leaders of modern destructive criticism as genuine, and from it have been drawn some of the weapons turned against the other epistles.

(3) If we were to look to these four letters only for

Paul's testimony concerning Jesus Christ we should find evidence of his preëxistence, as the " spiritual rock " that accompanied the Israelites in the desert, 1 Cor. 10:4; of his incarnation, when he " was made of a woman, made under law," Gal. 4:4; of his being " born of the seed of David according to the flesh," " but declared Son of God in power by resurrection of the dead," Rom. 1:3; of his " being without sin," 2 Cor. 5:21, yet " made sin," " made a curse," by suffering death in behalf of sinners, 2 Cor. 5:14, 21; Gal. 3:13; of his instituting the holy supper as a memorial of his death, 1 Cor. 11:23-26; of his resurrection from the dead, 1 Cor. 15:3-11, and of his being now the head of the body of which all believers in him are members, 1 Cor. 12:12, 27. Other points of less importance need not be enumerated. For no proper narratives of the life of Jesus should be looked for outside of the Gospels. The epistles of James, of Peter, of John, and of Jude do not record any of the miracles or parables of Jesus. They refer to the same kind of facts as are noticed in the epistles of Paul, and as the purpose of their letters led them to mention.

(4) Besides the remaining nine epistles of Paul, the first epistle of Peter, the first epistle of John, the four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles were received as genuine by all the churches in the time of Eusebius, the father of church history, about A.D. 300.

For our present purpose it is unnecessary to discuss the authenticity of the other books of the New Testament, viz., the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Revelation. For if these were of doubtful origin and credibility, the evidence for the supernatural origin of Christianity would not be seriously weakened. But —

(5) The *trustworthiness* of the *four Gospels* is a matter of the gravest interest, and their claim to our con-

fidence as historical records should be thoroughly examined. In support of that claim, which lives and breathes in almost every paragraph of the Gospels, may be urged the following considerations: —

a. *Early Christian Literature leads to the conclusion that they were all written before the end of the first century.*[1] Justin Martyr, about A.D. 140, refers to the *Memorabilia of the Apostles,* stating that in them were "taught all things concerning our Saviour, Jesus Christ," Apol. I. 33, and in his Dialogue with Trypho he speaks of "the *Memorabilia,* which, I say, were composed by the Apostles and those who follow them." And Tertullian, about A.D. 200, says, "of the Apostles, John and Matthew implant faith in us, of their followers, Luke and Mark refresh it." There is conclusive evidence that Tatian, a contemporary of Justin Martyr, composed a work called *Diatessaron,* based on the four Gospels, and couched in their language. And Irenæus argues that precisely four Gospels were required by the great harmonies of nature; that the perfection of the Gospel record demanded four narratives of the Lord's life.

b. *All the early versions of the New Testament known to scholars contain the four Gospels.* This evidence is important, though the precise date of the earliest version is not demonstrable. Yet there is reason to think it was not later than A.D. 170. The *Fragment on the Canon,* discovered by Muratori in 1738, was probably written about A.D. 170 in Greek. It begins with the last

[1] Literature: *Norton* (A.), "On the Genuineness of the Four Gospels"; *Tischendorf* (C.), "When Were Our Four Gospels Written?" *Westcott* (B. F.), "Introduction to the Study of the Four Gospels"; *Sanday* (W.), "The Gospels in the Second Century"; *Lardner* (N.), "Credibility of the Gospel History"; *Olshausen* (F.), "Die Echtheit der vier Canonischen Evangelien"; *Dale* (R. W.), "The Living Christ and the Four Gospels"; *Westcott* (B. F.), "On the Canon of the New Testament," very trustworthy.

words of a sentence which must have referred to the Gospel of Mark, and proceeds to speak of the *Third Gospel* as written by Luke, the physician, who did not see the Lord, and then of the *Fourth Gospel* as written by John, a disciple of the Lord, at the request of his fellow disciples and his elders. It is true that none of the early versions carry us back to the first century, but they afford clear evidence of general Christian belief from the middle of the second century onward, and it is scarcely credible that any important changes of that belief had taken place within the little more than fifty years between the death of John in Ephesus and the appearance of the earliest versions.

c. *The historical trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel,* though strenuously assailed by a school of modern critics, *has been satisfactorily vindicated.*[1] Baur relegated its origin to the second half of the second century, but the ablest defenders of his general theory have been constrained to give the Gospel an earlier and still earlier date, until it is plain that they have no valid grounds for denying that it was written in the last years of the first century.

But even if the fourth Gospel were written by John, it is thought by some to be untrustworthy, especially in its reports of the words of Jesus. In reply to this opinion it may be said in favor of the substantial accuracy of John's reports of the words of Jesus: (a) That his references to persons, places, and events are singularly exact and circumstantial; (b) That he wrote his Gospel for a special purpose, and naturally selected from the

[1] *Luthardt* (C. E.), "Authorship of the Fourth Gospel"; *Sanday* (W.), "The Fourth Gospel: Was John its Author?"; *Abbot* (E.), "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences" (in "Critical Essays," pp. 9-107); *Hovey* (A.), "Introduction to the Gospel of John"; *Weiss* (B.), "Introduction to the Gospel of John" (in Weiss-Meyer's Commentary).

sayings and discourses of Jesus, such as would subserve that purpose; (c) That there are passages in Matthew which strikingly resemble, both in tone and style, the teaching of Jesus as reported by John; (d) That John may have been peculiarly susceptible to the influence of such teaching, so that his own style was affected by it; and (e) That in translating the words of Jesus from Aramæan into Greek, John may have imparted something of his own style to his Lord's teaching, without being untrue to the essence of that teaching.

And if it be insisted that John was an old man when he wrote the Gospel, and, therefore, could not recall words heard long ago in his early manhood, it must be replied that he probably began to teach the words of Jesus soon after he heard them, and continued to teach them even to old age, — always reverencing them and striving to repeat them without change, — just as an aged minister of Christ now repeats many parts of Scripture, which he learned in early life and which he has repeated in the same terms a hundred or a thousand times. The trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel is not then disproved by the old age of its author.

d. *Few critical scholars now attempt to discredit the origin of the synoptical Gospels in the first century.* But some difference of judgment prevails as to their relation to one another. Many believe that the amount of verbal agreement between them points to dependence on one another, or on original sources no longer extant in separate works. In the preface to his Gospel Luke speaks of several attempts to narrate the life of Jesus, and intimates that they were not altogether satisfactory; but he says nothing which identifies them with Matthew and Mark.

Papias says that " Matthew composed the *Logia,* or Oracles, in Hebrew, and each one interpreted them as he was able." He also affirms that " Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he re-

membered; though he did not [record] in order that which was either said or done by Christ; but subsequently, as I said [attached himself to] Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the wants [of his hearers]; and not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses." The *Logia* of Matthew may have antedated the Gospel of Mark, and Mark may have borrowed a few passages from that work; but a critical study of the second Gospel confirms the statement of Papias, that it represents the discourses of Peter concerning the ministry of Jesus. The *Logia* are the basis of the first Gospel, but it contains many things found also in Mark. The third Gospel was probably written after the first and the second, drawing more or less of its materials from the sources used by them.

But whatever may have been the original relation of these Gospels to one another, whether that of dependence or that of independence, they are remarkable for *unity in diversity*.[1] Indeed, the same is true of the four Gospels. The records are diverse, yet harmonious. So marked are the differences, even in relating the same events, that some have affirmed contradiction; yet so deep and pervading is the harmony, that others have inferred transcription. It is impossible to suppose the life and character of Jesus Christ an *ideal* originated by *one* of the Evangelists, since this view would not account for the striking *diversity* in the narratives; and it is equally

[1] *Ullmann* (C.), "The Sinlessness of Jesus," "Evidence of Christianity" (Ch. III, § 4, pp. 93-107); *Bushnell* (H.), "The Character of Jesus Forbidding His Possible Classification with Men"; *Dorner* (J. A.), "The Sinless Perfection of Christ," Am. Presby. & Theol. Rev. for 1863; *Schaff* (P.), "The Person of Christ"; *Young* (J.), "The Christ of History"; *Seeley* (J. R.), "Ecce Homo"; *Parker* (J.), "Ecce Deus"; *Row* (C. A.), "The Jesus of the Evangelists"; *Hovey* (A.), "Madison Avenue Lectures," p. 12 ff.; *Alexander* (J. L.), "Christ and Christianity," "The Self Revelation of Christ."

impossible to suppose the *ideal* originated by more than one of them, since the *unity* of impression would not be accounted for. But if there was such a person as Jesus Christ, whose history the Gospels honestly recite, we have no difficulty whatever in accounting for the wonderful *harmony in diversity* which they exhibit. For we have in them four portraits of the same original, though taken by different artists and from different points of view.

e. *The evangelists were men of good judgment, as the Gospels clearly prove.* They do not write like enthusiasts or fanatics, but like men of sound sense and practical aim. Their writings prove them to have possessed more than average intelligence. And the facts which they relate are, for the most part, such as could be fairly attested by the senses, — facts that could be seen or heard, or verified by touch or taste or smell. No scientific training was needed to prepare them to testify of such events as are related in the Gospels.

f. Moreover, *they were upright.* This may be inferred from the tone of sincerity and earnestness which pervades their writings, from the spirituality of the religious doctrines which they inculcate, from the kind of motives to which they appeal, from the perfection of the moral principles which they teach, and from the simplicity, frankness, minuteness, positiveness, and objectiveness of their style. These writers go through their work as if they had taken no part in it themselves and had nothing at stake in the matter. One could scarcely infer from their language that they had forsaken all for Christ, and were ready to lay down their lives for his sake. They never eulogize his character, and rarely his teaching. They scarcely allude to many questions which awaken the utmost curiosity in men addicted to religious speculation. "In its grand, childlike, and holy simplicity, the narrative passes by such questions of the intellect,

just as a child moves among the riddles of nature and of life, as if they existed not."

g. Finally, it is impossible to conceive of any motive which could have led dishonest men to write as they did. If they bore false witness in respect to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, they did it with no prospect of gain in this life, or in that which is to come. Not one of them pushes himself to the front in his narrative; not one of them, unless it were John in his old age, could have expected to be specially remembered or honored because of his connection with the Jewish Rabbi who had been crucified by Pilate in Jerusalem, and whose sect had been everywhere defamed.

The result of our study of the Gospels is plain — their historical trustworthiness. *They are entitled to full confidence when stating, clearly, matters of fact; and a discovery now and then of minor, unintentional errors would not invalidate our conclusion.* This result may appear to be small and the process of reaching it slow; but it is important for the investigation that is to follow.

Our *second* proposition is that THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES, ESPECIALLY THE GOSPELS, PROVE THAT JESUS CHRIST WAS AN INFALLIBLE TEACHER.

By an infallible teacher is meant one who teaches truth without any mixture of error, one whose instruction, in whatever form it may be given, will prove to be wholly correct when rightly apprehended. Such a teacher may or may not be omniscient; but if he is not omniscient, he must clearly perceive the limits of his knowledge, and confine his teaching within those limits. Hence the teaching of prophets and apostles may have been infallible, if it was restricted to what the Holy Spirit moved them to say. But this inerrancy of Christ, or of prophets and apostles (*i. e.,* inspired men), refers only to *what* they teach and not to the forms of speech or illustration

by which that teaching is expressed — a point which will be further explained in the sequel.

With what, then, shall we begin our proof that these writings manifest the inerrancy of Christ's teaching? A teacher from God may be presumed to know, better than anyone else, the work intrusted to him. And if he defines his work, it will be safe to make his definition the basis of study in trying to ascertain the nature of that work. It would obviously be unsafe to ascribe to him any attribute or authority which he disclaims. Our discussion of the point in question may therefore begin with a brief survey of the claims put forth by Jesus Christ as a teacher. Taking his own words for our guide, What did he know? And how did he teach?

1. *What did he claim to know?* He claimed to know heavenly things directly, John 3:11-13; 8:38; the divine Father directly, Matt. 11:27; John 6:46; 7:28, 29; 8:55; 10:15; 17:10-12; that his words were his Father's words, John 7:16; 8:28; 12:49; 14:10-24; 17:8; and were immutably true, Mark 13:31; John 14:6. He also claimed to be one with the Father, John 10:30-38; 17:10-22; to do always the things that are pleasing to the Father, John 8:29; and to know all that the Father himself does, at least in the matter of human salvation, John 5:20. This, in brief, was the claim of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, and it surely amounts to a claim of entire correctness in his teaching. His teaching was his Father's teaching, and must therefore have been, in his own judgment, free from error.

2. *How did he teach?* He spoke almost always in the first person singular, and in language of divine authority. There are but seven exceptions to the former statement on record, John 3:11; 4:22; 9:4; 14:23; 17:11, 21, 22; and in four of these Jesus associates himself with the Father. The others can be readily explained without assuming that he ranked any human teacher as his peer,

or thought of his own words as needing confirmation by man.

Again, he spoke as if he were the final and perfect teacher, Matt. 5:17 ff.; 19:8, 9; Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33. The only apparent exception to this statement is the language of Jesus concerning the Paraclete whom he would send to his disciples after his own departure. But the Paraclete was to take of the things of Christ and show them to the disciples. He would be able to lead them into more truth simply because they would be then prepared to receive it. Jesus virtually claims that he could and would have revealed it to them, if they had been prepared to accept it. Still further, he represented the salvation of men as depending on their treatment of his words, Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; John 12:48; 14:23; 15:7. Finally, he always spoke as one perfectly master of the situation, of the theme and the occasion, never confessing that he was in error on any point, and never seeming to work his way up from a lower to a higher view. He always looked down upon his subject.

At the same time he declared himself to be meek and lowly in heart, willing to perform the humblest service to his disciples and mankind. He was ever obedient to his Father's will, an instance of moral perfection in a sinful world, teaching men their duty by his example as well as by his words. We discover no trace of pride or fanaticism or self-seeking in his ministry, and must therefore attach the highest importance to what he says concerning his teaching and conduct. See Matt. 11:29; John 13:4-13; 5:30; 6:38; 7:18; 4:34.

This was the manner of Christ; and on any fair interpretation of it, it was in perfect accord with his claim to inerrancy as a teacher. The two were in such perfect harmony as to double the strength of each. They make it almost certain that his sense of perfect knowledge as to all that he taught was constant, natural, and control-

ling. His claims were positive, and he was too humble, self-denying, and holy to be mistaken in making them.

The following facts appear to confirm his claims to infallibility and sinlessness: —

(1) *His immediate disciples were convinced of their rightfulness.* For a. they ascribe to him perfect knowledge, Matt. 9:4; Mark 2:8; John 2:24, 25; Acts 1:24; Rev. 2:23; John 16:30; 21:17; 6:64; 18:4. b. They declare him to be full of truth, and the source of truth, John 1:14, 16. c. They preach his doctrine as preëminently the truth, 2 Cor. 4:2 ff.; Gal. 2:5; Eph. 4:21; 2 Tim. 2:15.

(2) *Readers of the Gospels have been convinced of their rightfulness.* The total impression made by the testimony of the Gospels has generally had this effect, and the value of such testimony cannot easily be overrated. It does not depend on minute points of criticism which only a scholar can understand. It depends on the broader features and general tone of the narratives, and can be appreciated by every upright mind. The eye of an unlearned but thoughtful reader is almost certain to take in the great features of the picture, and judge them correctly. In this connection it is noteworthy that the evangelists do not seem to have chosen their materials with any special view to proving the moral perfection of Jesus. See Matt. 19:17; 8:28-34; Mark 11:12-14; Luke 24:28.

(3) *His doctrines agree with his claims.* This is evident when we consider with sufficient care their simplicity, their self-consistency, their moral purity, their comprehensiveness, their practicalness, and their good influence.[1]

(4) *Many predictions made by him have been fulfilled.*

[1] *Wendt* (H. H.), "The Teaching of Jesus"; *Hovey* (A.), "Teaching of Jesus Christ" in "Christian Teaching and Life," Part I.

A knowledge of future events is often good evidence that God is witn him who possesses it; and a permanent possession of such knowledge is evidence of the permanent presence of God with the possessor. Now the evangelists testify that Jesus predicted his own death and resurrection, Matt. 12:40; 16:21-23; 17:22, 23; 20:17-19, 22, 23; 26:1, 2; Mark 10:38, 39; Luke 9:44; 12:50; 13:33; 17:22, 25; John 2:19-22; 12:7, 23, 32-34; that he predicted his desertion by his disciples, his betrayal by one of them, and his denial by another, Mark 14:18-21, 72; Matt. 26:31-34; John 13:11, 18-26, and several other facts concerning them, Matt. 20:23; 10:17-22; John 21:18; Mark 14:13-16, and that he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem in that generation, Matt. 24:2, 4, 5, 23-26; Mark 13:14; Luke 21:12, 16, 20 f. The exact fulfillment of these predictions is good reason for believing that all his teaching was true.[1]

Exception considered. If it be objected that one of his predictions, that of his personal return to earth, has failed, see Matt. 24:34, it may be answered that his language may not have referred to a visible return to reign as King in Jerusalem, but only to the destruction of Jerusalem — a type of the final judgment of the wicked (Bengel, Robinson, and others). Yet the passages are confessedly dark and difficult of interpretation, and we cannot be sure that we understand them. Of course we are unable to find in them anything that disproves the infallibility of Jesus. See John 12:24, 32, 33; 16:7-11; Acts 3:19-21; Matt. 28:19, 20, and *per contra* Rev. 20:4-6; 1 Thess. 4:13-17; 1 Cor. 15:51-54.

(5) *Many miracles were wrought by him.* Miracles are changes in nature which must rationally be ascribed to divine agency; or events in the world of sense,

[1] Comp. Euseb. H. E. III. v.; *Robinson's* Researches III. 320 ff., and *Broadus* on Matt. 24:16.

which, according to sound principles of reason, should be ascribed to extraordinary action on the part of God.

The miracles of Christ served a double purpose: *first,* to reveal his character and spirit, and in this light they are a part of his teaching; and *secondly,* to attest the truth of his claims, and in this light they are equivalent to a ratification of his authority, Matt. 11:21; Mark 2:10, 11; John 2:23; 3:2; 5:36, 37, etc.[1]

Objections to Miracles

The objections often urged against the credibility of miracles are as follows: — Human testimony for miracles is nullified:

a. By man's predisposition to believe in them; b. by the observed uniformity of nature; c. by the certainty that God's works are perfect; d. by the fact that God is nothing but a blind force immanent in all things.

(a) To the *first* objection we reply, that every normal bias of the mind points in the direction of truth, and if followed wisely and cautiously will lead to truth. And if it is a "fact that mankind have, in different ages, been

[1] Miracles are called in the New Testament ἔργα, δυνάμεις, τέρατα, or σημεῖα. The last two words frequently come together. Indeed, τέρατα is never used apart from σημεῖα, but they appear together sixteen times, if not more. θαῦμα in 2 Cor. 11:14 means a wonder or a marvel. θαυμάσια in Matt. 21:15, and θαυμάστα in 1 Pet. 2:9; Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:11, wonders.

Hume (D.), "Of Miracles," (Essays, Vol. II.); *Powell* (B.), "On the study of the Evidences of Christianity," in "Essays and Reviews"; *Campbell* (G.), "Treatise on Miracles"; *Wardlaw* (R.), "On Miracles"; *Mozley* (J. B.), "Miracles"; *Warington* (G.), "Can we believe in Miracles?"; *Westcott* (B. F.), "Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles"; *Bushnell* (H.), "Nature and the Supernatural," esp. p. 338; *Hovey* (A.), "The Miracles of Christ as attested by the Evangelists"; *McCosh* (J.), "The Supernatural in the Natural"; *Mansel* (H. L.), "On Miracles as Evidences of Christianity," in "Aids of Faith."

strangely deluded with pretences to miracles and wonders," "it is by no means to be admitted that they have been oftener, or are at all, more liable to be deceived by these than by other pretences."[1]

(b) To the *second* objection we reply, that the order of nature is as truly modified by every free act of man as by a miracle. Within certain limits man has power to act upon the forces and sequences of nature — to disturb them, to resist them, to combine them, to guide them, to reinforce them; how much more, then, may God, the Supreme Mind, control, supplement, overpower, or supersede the forces of nature, to accomplish a high purpose! — to restore the moral order which he loves, but which man has subverted for a time!

(c) To the *third* objection we may reply, it is by no means self-evident that a world, complete in itself, needing no care or help in any emergency, would be a better world than one needing care and help. The oak is not necessarily better than the vine. If a universe comprehends in itself created beings who are moral, and are to be trained by moral influences, it cannot be shown that a need of divine interposition, making natural forces bend to the exigencies of moral order, would be an imperfection. "A created universe," says Richard Rothe, "which was in itself so perfectly organized that the entrance of the direct agency of God could not be admitted ... would be a barrier for God, and, consequently, as a creature, most imperfect." Imperfection belongs to the very idea of the created. A creature can never be sufficient unto itself. "The only possible barrier to the activity of God would be the self-contradictory, unreasonable, and therefore unholy."[2]

(d) To the *fourth* objection we may reply, that it is an argument against theism rather than an argument against

[1] *Butler* (J.), "Analogy," Part II., ch. 7.

[2] *Rothe,* "Still Hours," p. 324, f.

miracles; it pronounces the existence of God incredible, and therefore the occurrence of miracles incredible. If nature is all, then the forces of nature will always have their way. There is nothing to prevent it. Their way will be a blind way, but it is the way they will go. Hence Baur and Strauss, resting on their denial of any God but nature, were logically consistent in denying the possibility of miracles. Pantheism, as well as atheism, is *per se* a rejection of the Christian religion, but pantheism is false, and inferences from it are worthless.

(e) The occurrence of a single miracle would show the emptiness of all these objections. If Christ really existed as a supernatural being, or if he rose from the dead according to the Scriptures, the objections reviewed would have no force at all. But for the existence of Jesus Christ in Palestine, and his crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, we appeal to the entire New Testament, and indeed to the existence of Christianity in the world. Both are unaccountable apart from the actual life and ministry of Jesus Christ at the beginning of our era.

But what can be said of the testimony offered by the evangelists to the wonderful works of Jesus of Nazareth? This, in brief: that the number of witnesses is sufficient, their integrity above suspicion, their powers of observation and memory excellent, their testimony positive, independent, and substantially harmonious, and their references to attendant circumstances numerous and natural. It is also noticeable that the phenomena which they attest were sensible, that the aim of Christ's miracles was godlike, and that his teaching is often represented as growing out of his miracles. Moreover, there is no rebutting testimony. No one who was present is known to have denied the events recorded by the evangelists, and only one who was present could bear witness that such events did not then and there take place.

For these reasons, — the claim of Jesus himself, and

the facts which have been adduced in support of that claim, — we look to Jesus Christ, the Leader and Perfecter of the faith, the Light of the world, as an infallible Teacher, and believe all his words to be true, according to the sense and purpose with which there are good grounds for believing that he employed them. The task of interpretation is sometimes difficult, but the resulting truth is pure and sanctifying.

What, then, did he teach concerning the message which his disciples were to bear to mankind? How did he say that they should be qualified for their work of reporting his words and making known his gospel to the world? This question can be answered by a study of his words as recorded by them and explained by their conduct.

Our *third* proposition, then, is: THAT THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES, ESPECIALLY THE GOSPELS, PROVE THAT JESUS CHRIST PROMISED THE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT TO HIS APOSTLES, BY WHOM, WITH SOME OF THEIR ASSOCIATES, THE NEW TESTAMENT WAS WRITTEN.

The word "inspiration" is here used to signify a work of the Spirit upon the mind as well as upon the heart; upon the intellect as well as upon the affections. It touches the whole spiritual being, the understanding, the memory, the feelings, the will. It imparts moral sensitiveness, courage, fairness, purpose, and energy. It empowers the inner man to do a sacred and difficult work as it ought to be done. Especially does it assist the mind in receiving, comprehending, and recalling religious truth, and in presenting it effectively to other men. In this sense, we use the word "inspiration," but the reasons for this use of the term will appear later.

1. The promises referred to in the proposition before us are found in Matt. 10:19, 20; Mark 13:11; Luke 12:11, 12; John 14:15-17, 26; 15:26, 27; 16:7-15;

Acts 1:5, 8. (Compare John 20:22, 23; 7:38, 39; Acts 2:17-21.) According to the first three evangelists, the Spirit was to be given to assist them in making their apology when brought before rulers. The Spirit was to assist them, not only in thought but also in expression. And to judge by the recorded apologies of Peter and Paul, his help was specially useful in their defence of Christianity while defending themselves.

According to the fourth evangelist, the inspiration of the Spirit was given to assist them in all their ministry as teachers of Christian truth, John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7, 13-15.

2. These passages, interpreted simply and naturally, prove

(1) That the Holy Spirit would be the Advocate of the Father and the Son in and with the Apostles. This follows from the use of the word "Advocate" compared with John 16:14, 15. (2) That the Spirit would bring to their remembrance all that Jesus himself had said to them (John 14:26). And if this verse does not specify the *works* as well as the *words* of Christ, the former were inseparably connected with the latter and are fairly included in the promise of John 16:14, 15. (3) That the Spirit would show them "things to come," literally, "the things to come." This language assured them of prophetic inspiration, — of light through the Spirit as to future events in the reign of Christ. (4) That the Spirit "would teach them all things" or "guide them into all the truth," meaning, doubtless, all the truth concerning Christ and his redemptive work which properly belongs to revealed religion.

That these promises, as a whole, were meant for the Apostles only, we believe,

a. Because they were addressed to them only.

b. Because they assured them of suitable endowment for a special work.

c. Because history forbids us to suppose them to have been meant for all Christians.

d. Yet it is doubtless true that some expressions in the promise of Jesus to the Eleven have been fulfilled to other Christians. See John 14:16; 16:8-11. And it is clear from John 7:38, 39, and Acts 2:17-21, that the work of the Holy Spirit was to be widely extended and powerful among believers in Christ, after his ascension to the right hand of God. But, guided by Paul's discussion of spiritual gifts, in 1 Cor. 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters we are satisfied that the spiritual or inspirational endowments of the Apostles were distinctly superior to those of other teachers, so that they were qualified by them to declare with authority the essential truths concerning Jesus Christ, his work, and his kingdom. (Compare John 20:22, 23; Eph. 2:20; Rev. 21:14, with Matt. 16:17-19.)

e. It is now to be observed that Paul was added to the original group of Apostles by the choice of Christ, and was, therefore, in need of the same kind of inspiration which was promised to them. See Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 1:1; 9:1; Gal. 2:6-9; 1 Pet. 1:12; 2 Pet. 3:15, 16. Moreover, Paul himself and, by parity of reason, the other Apostles had a variety of gifts for their great and special ministry, 1 Cor. 14:18, 19; Acts 2:4, 6, 7; 19:6; 8:14-17; 2 Tim. 1:6; 1 Cor. 2:6 f.; 3:10; 12:8; Acts 13:9-11; 14:3, 8-10; 19:11, 12, etc. The Apostles seem to have been severally endowed with all the "gifts" possessed by any Christians of their time, in addition to some which they alone received.

f. This fulfillment of a comprehensive promise, by a variety of special gifts, answering to the wants of the churches, 1 Cor. 12:11; Heb. 2:4, is in accord with the idea of a progressive revelation, and with all we know of divine Providence. The homogeneous is differentiated; the nebula is resolved into separate stars; society

advances by division of labor. So in the churches; all did not speak with tongues or prophesy; not all were evangelists or apostles. But, for the sake of immutable foundations and good order, there were a few whose endowments qualified them to guide the rest; and these were the Apostles.

g. It is now evident that the promise of "the spirit of truth," as made by Jesus to his Apostles, was intended primarily, and, at least in part, *exclusively,* for them. It is not, in all its language, directly applicable to Christians of all times. *But all Christians may have the full benefit of it mediately; for all may have the assistance of the Spirit in studying the inspired truth of Scripture.*

If we turn to the Teaching of the Apostles, in so far as it is preserved in the New Testament, it will be found to be, like that of their Master, in a high degree *positive, spiritual, self-consistent, and practical,* and we are convinced that it inculcates Christian truth without any tincture of error. Not, of course, the whole truth in the case of any one of them; for Paul speaks for all the Apostles when he says, "We know in part, and we prophesy in part"; but, none the less, truth that will never be superseded but only complemented, truth that was suited to the condition of those addressed and that will never cease to be precious.

Objections to Inerrancy

But objections have been made to the teaching of the Apostles, — objections which are said to prove that inspiration did not preserve them from error. The most important of these objections must be named:

1. *That the Apostles may not have been always true to their convictions.* Of this, however, there is no real evidence, unless it be found in Peter's conduct at Antioch, Gal. 2: 11-13, or Paul's language to the Sanhedrin, Acts 23: 3-5. But Peter's error was one of private conduct,

and Paul's language was probably that of honest, scornful indignation.

2. *That they taught contradictory doctrines,* — a charge which is founded on a superficial and incorrect interpretation of their language.

3. *That they often misinterpreted passages of the Old Testament,* — a statement which cannot, we think, be verified, though the *prima facie* import of certain passages would seem to justify it.

4. *That they expected the final coming of Christ in their day.* They did not *teach* that this coming would be in their day, and there is room for doubt whether they *expected* it so soon. They seem to have regarded that event as *conditioned* on others of uncertain date, Acts 3:19-21; 2 Thess. 2:3-8; Rom. 11:25.

5. *They confessed their own ignorance and forgetfulness,* 1 Cor. 1:14-16. This confession favors the view that when they wrote positively their knowledge was certain (cf. 2 Cor. 12:2, 3).

6. *That some writers were not Apostles.* Again we are reminded that not all the New Testament was written by apostles. Yet (1) John Mark, who is credited with the authorship of the second Gospel, was associated closely at times with Barnabas, with Paul, and with Peter, Acts 15:37, 39; 2 Tim. 4:11; 1 Pet. 5:13. Irenæus calls him the *interpres et sectator Petri* (Hær. iii. 10:6). Tertullian calls him Peter's *interpres* (Con. Mar. iv. 5), and Eusebius (H. E. II. 15) represents the Roman Christians as soliciting Mark to put in writing the gospel as preached by Peter. With this the testimony of Papias substantially agrees, and the probability is very great that we have in the second Gospel the history of Christ's ministry as Peter was accustomed to report it.

(2) Luke, to whom the composition of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles is attributed, was a companion of Paul during a part of his third missionary

tour, his last visit to Jerusalem, his two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea, his voyage to Rome, and some part of his double imprisonment there. He was also able, it may be presumed, to learn much of the history of Christ from other apostles. And he professes to have "accurately followed all from the beginning, and to have written everything in order."

(3) The writers of the epistles of James and Jude were probably brothers of Jesus, converted to discipleship by his resurrection from the dead, and personally acquainted with several of the Twelve.

(4) The Epistle to the Hebrews may have been written by the suggestion and with the approval of Paul by Luke or some other disciple. This would account for its being early ascribed to Paul himself.

Plainly, all these writers were devout Christians, desirous above all things else of making known the truth in its purity. They would, therefore, if possible, have submitted their writings to the Apostles for correction, in case they had not been fully assured of their own inspiration. But many associates of the Apostles were inspired, Acts 2 : 17, 18; 11 : 27, 28; 21 : 9; 1 Cor. 11 : 4; 14 : 24-32, and it is therefore reasonable to suppose that writers of New Testament books were thus qualified for their work. For oral teaching could not have been regarded as more sacred or important than written teaching. The latter must have been resorted to as likely to be more widely diffused and permanent than the former, especially in such cases as the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which must have been intended for wide circulation.

Our *fourth* proposition is, THAT JESUS CHRIST, TOGETHER WITH HIS INSPIRED APOSTLES AND THEIR ASSOCIATES, INDORSED THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES AS FROM GOD.

1. *These Scriptures existed in the time of Christ.* To establish this proposition it must be shown that the Old Testament Scriptures existed in the time of Christ as a well-known collection of sacred writings; for some of the books found in the Old Testament are not referred to distinctively in the New Testament. It may, perhaps, be sufficient to state that competent scholars are now agreed in holding that our present Old Testament books were the accredited sacred writings of the Palestinian Jews in the time of Christ, and during the century and a half that preceded his advent.[1]

(1) Words in the Preface to the "Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach," show that the Old Testament was divided into three parts before the time of Christ; namely, the Law, the Prophets, and the Rest of the Books, — a division which was distinctly recognized by the risen Saviour, Luke 24: 44.

(2) Moreover, the words of Josephus in his work against Apion (cc. 7, 8) show that the Jews had books which they did not consider inspired or sacred; that prophetic origin or approval was esteemed necessary to render a book sacred; that they did not venture to modify such a book in any way; that the number of their sacred books was supposed to be complete; and that none of them were written after the time of Artaxerxes. Their number was twenty-two, equalling the letters of the He-

[1] See *Horne* (T. H.), "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," last edition; *Keil* (C. F.), "Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament"; *Bleek* (F.), "Introduction to the Old Testament"; *De Wette* (W. M. L.), "Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament"; *Bissell* (C. C.), "The Canon of the Old Testament" in Bib. Sac. 1880; *Ryle* (H. E.), "The Canon of the Old Testament"; *Driver* (S. R.), "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament"; and the principal articles on the Old Testament Canon in the great Dictionaries and Encyclopædias of the Bible.

brew alphabet, viz., Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, — Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, Daniel, Ezra, Chronicles, Esther, — Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles. Ruth was included in Judges, Lamentations in Jeremiah, and Nehemiah in Ezra. Origen and Jerome follow Josephus.

(3) But "it is admitted[1] that there was a controversy in the Jewish Rabbinical schools of the first century after Christ concerning three books, — Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, — and, to a limited extent, concerning a fourth, viz., Proverbs, whether they had been admitted to the Canon on sufficient or on insufficient grounds," in other words, whether they ought to be excluded from the Canon, or retained in it. They were, however, retained, doubtless because a majority of Jewish teachers believed them to be worthy of a place in the canon of sacred writings.

2. *How Jesus and the New Testament writers used them.* (1) As examples of the use which Jesus made of the Old Testament we may study the following passages: Matt. 21:42; 22:29; 26:54, 56; Luke 4:21; 24:46; John 5:39; 7:38; 10:35; 13:18; 17:12; Matt. 5:17-19; 7:12; 22:36-40; Luke 16:17; 24:44; 11:49.[2]

(2) As examples from the words of Peter, Acts 1:16, 20; 2:16 f., 23, 25, 30, 31; 3:18, 21-26; 4:25; 10:43; 1 Pet. 1:10-12, 16, 24, 25; 2:6-8; 3:6, 10-12, 14, 20; 4:18; 2 Pet. 1:19-21; 2:16; 3:2.

(3) The words of John, 1:17; 12:14 f.; 19:24, 36.

(4) The words of Paul, his view of the Mosaic law, Rom. 7:7-12; Gal. 3:23, 24; his view of ancient proph-

[1] See *Bissell* in Bib. Sac. 1886, p. 91..

[2] See *Lechler* (D. G. V.), "The Old Testament in the Discourses of Jesus," "Christian Review," vol. 24, pp. 368-390; 543-574.

ecy, Gal. 3:8; Rom. 9:25; 12:20 f.; and his view of sacred history, Gal. 4:21-31; 1 Cor. 10:1-6. His view of the entire Old Testament may be seen in 2 Tim. 3:14-17.[1] The thirteen Epistles of Paul contain more than one hundred and twenty-five citations from the Old Testament, taken from Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Habakkuk, and Malachi. And the Epistle to the Hebrews, written by Paul or by some one who had imbibed his doctrine, has fifty-three quotations from the same volume.

Richard Rothe affirms that all the writers of the New Testament, whether Apostles or not, "consider the words of the Old Testament, direct words of God, and quote them as such. They see nothing in the Holy Book which is merely the word of its human author, and not at the same time God's word."[2] This statement may need some qualification, but it represents fairly the general view of New Testament writers. They evidently believed that moral and religious influence, by means of truth, emanated from the sacred writings, and that these "writings were able to make men wise unto salvation through faith, which is in Christ Jesus."

3. From this survey of facts we conclude that *no one is justified in accepting the New Testament as God's word, without accepting the Old Testament also as equally God's word,* — not, however, as an equally clear or full or useful revelation of the mind of God to men of the present age, but as no less truly a revelation from God, and one that was adapted to the mental and religious condition of those to whom it was first given. *In vetere Testamento Novum latet, in Novo Testamento vetus patet.* The two revelations belong to one system.

[1] See "Studies in Ethics and Religion," p. 178 f.

[2] Dogmatik, p. 180.

They differ as twilight differs from sunlight, both revealing the same source but with different degrees of clearness. The clouds were thick and almost continuous over the sky of the earlier revelation, and the light broke through at comparatively few points, while over the sky of the later revelation are but thin and scattered clouds which do little to intercept the shining rays of the sun of righteousness. In other words, the thoughts and speech of the Israelites in the period of the earlier dispensation were less perfect *media* for revealing God to men than were those of the time of Christ. In still other words, the earlier and obscurer disclosures of God's will gradually clarified the thoughts and speech of the people, and made it possible for God to improve his revelation of himself to them.[1] All this is perfectly consistent with the indorsement of the Old Testament as a revelation from God by Jesus Christ and his inspired Apostles — a revelation in forms of speech which are to be interpreted fairly, and their religious teaching accepted as an incipient and preparatory foreshadowing of truth that would be fully declared when men were able to receive it.

4. But the credit due to the Old Testament Scriptures as a revelation of God does not rest solely on the words of Christ and his Apostles. *Their character as historical records is in some respects very high.*

(1) They are distinguished for the impartiality with which they record the faults and sins and disasters of the chosen people or of its heroes. A divine conscience seems to hold their writers to the strict line of honest biography and history. If they contain errors, these errors are not intentional. No one can read the narratives concerning Abraham, Jacob, David, and Jeremiah, without feeling that those who wrote them intended to be veracious.

[1] Comp. "The Sacred Writings," in "Studies in Ethics and Religion," pp. 90-107.

(2) They are remarkable for the accuracy of their references to places in the Holy Land and adjacent countries. Modern discoveries have confirmed the truth of the Old Testament books in this respect so often that they are looked upon as authorities which it is rash to dispute.

(3) The same may be said of their allusions to life and conduct among the ancient Israelites, Syrians, Phœnicians, Egyptians, Arabians, and other Oriental peoples. They are at home in the realm of nature and custom, but not in that of fiction. All this is fitted to inspire confidence in their words.

(4) Turning from history to prophecy it will be found that many predictions of the Old Testament have been fulfilled. This fact may have been overworked as a proof of the inspiration and authority of Scripture. But it cannot be ruled out of court, or pronounced of slight value. The predictions respecting Babylon, Nineveh, Jerusalem, the Jewish nation, and the Messiah, together with their fulfillment, as described by sacred or profane historians, afford evidence that their authors were enlightened by the Spirit of God. Against this it is urged that some biblical predictions have not been fulfilled, though the time of their fulfillment has passed. Hence it is thought that those which have been fulfilled were no more than happy guesses.

But two things may be said in answer to this reasoning: a. that predictions were very often conditional. The evil foretold would come to pass unless the conditions calling for it were removed, or the blessing foretold would be imparted unless it was forfeited by sinfulness, Jonah 3:10; 4:2; Jer. 18:7-10. And b. that predictions were frequently couched in highly figurative language. When this was the case, their real fulfillment is not always recognized. Most of the Jews in our Saviour's time did not recognize in him the fulfillment of

any Messianic prophecies. Yet they were fulfilled, nevertheless, in a most surprising manner.

(5) Again, the prophets are distinctly represented as being called to their work by God himself, — a call which they often accepted with great reluctance and self-distrust. Moses, Ex. 3:11-4:17; Isa. 6:5-8; Jer. 1:5-10; Eze. 1:1-2:10. Moreover, "scattered all through the prophetic writings are expressions which speak of some strong and irresistible impulse coming down on the prophet, determining his attitude to the events of his time, constraining his utterance, making his words a vehicle of a higher meaning than his own."[1] The prophets, as well as the Apostles, were eminently sane men, and it is evident that they steadfastly claim to deliver specific messages from Jehovah, — messages imparted to them in such a way that they could not hesitate as to their divine origin.

(6) Finally, the religious teaching of the Old Testament, when compared with that of other sacred books of as early date, is preëminent for its purity and power. The law which is said to have been given by Moses, the Psalms, the writings of Isaiah, and of the other prophets, possess extraordinary qualities, commending them to the reason, the moral intuitions, and the religious nature of man. And, in the language of another, "it is proper for us to remember, that what we call criticism is not the only valid test of the genuineness and worth of any piece of writing of great practical interest to mankind: there is, in addition, the test of actual use and service, in direct contact with the common sense and the moral sense of large masses of men, under various conditions, and for a long period. Probably no writing which is

[1] *W. Sanday.* See, as illustrations of this, Isa. 8:11; Jer. 15:17; Eze. 3:14; 8:1 ff.; and cf. Deut. 18:18-20; *Hovey* (A.), "Studies in Ethics and Religion," p. 154 f.; *Sanday* (W.), "The Oracles of God," p. 48 f.

not essentially sound and true has ever survived this test."[1]

(7) The facts which have been adduced distinguish the Holy Scriptures from all other books, and give to their teaching a unique and divine authority, — an authority which, apart from errors in the text, is equal to that of oral instruction by prophets or apostles. They are not mere ordinary records of divinely guided events; *they are records of messages and events, made or adopted by men under the impulse and guidance of the Spirit of Truth.*

This is our provisional account of the Holy Scriptures as inspired writings. If, as we are sometimes told, the whole history of Israel was inspired, surely the teaching of prophets which did so much to shape that history was inspired, and if the prophets were inspired to receive and deliver their messages in the first instance, how can we hesitate to believe that they were equally inspired to put them in writing for the permanent instruction of the people? Only in the case of Christ can we suppose that the events recorded were more perfectly controlled by the Spirit of God than was the work of recording them; and, even in this case, our only means of knowing those events is the record which the evangelists made, with the help of the Spirit.

Of course, our provisional account of the Holy Scriptures as inspired writings needs more or less explanation. It must be interpreted in harmony with the view, that the mind of God was gradually revealed to men and committed to writing, Heb. 1 : 1; that it was expressed by words and figures of speech which were, as a rule, intelligible to the people first addressed; and that the object sought with unswerving consistency was religious not scientific: the spiritual renovation of men, not their in-

[1] *Prof. Moses Coit Tyler,* in "North Am. Rev.," July, 1896, p. 15.

struction in literature or art; their restoration to fellowship with God, and not their acquaintance with physical law. These facts must be kept in mind when we speak of the teaching of Scripture as being in deepest reality God's word, and thus the standard of Christian truth and duty.

Mode of Inspiration

It is now desirable to ascertain, as far as possible, the effect of inspiration on those who were inspired, and, through them, on their teaching. Many theories have been proposed concerning this effect, four of which are worthy of special consideration, and these four may be characterized, respectively, as *verbal, dynamical, religious dynamical,* and *gracious* inspiration.

The *first* theory assumes that the Spirit of God suggested the words as well as the ideas of the sacred books to their writers; the *second,* that the Spirit of God so pervaded and energized the mental powers of the sacred writers as to make their *whole* work divine-human; the *third,* that this action of the Spirit ensured the possession and expression of pure *religious* truth by those writers, while all other knowledge was gained and used by their unassisted natural powers; and the *fourth,* that all renewed men have the same kind of inspiration — *viz.,* the action of the Holy Spirit in their minds — which serves to make their religious teaching pure and true in proportion to their personal holiness.

1. In support of plenary *verbal* inspiration[1] the follow-

[1] *Haldane* (R.), "The Books of the Old and New Testaments Proved to be Canonical, and Their Verbal Inspiration Maintained and Established"; *Carson* (A.), "The Theories of Inspiration of the Rev. Daniel Wilson, Rev. Dr. Pye Smith, and the Rev. Dr. Dick proved to be Erroneous"; *Gaussen* (I. R. L.), "Theopneusty; or, the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures"; *Bannerman* (J.), "Inspiration; the Infallible Truth and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures"; *Smith* (J. P.), "How God

ing points have been made: (1) It is required by the object of inspiration, namely, the conveyance of religious truth to mankind. For thought and language are inseparable; in teaching, correct expression is just as necessary as correct knowledge. (2) It is implied in the occasional use of language by the sacred writers which they did not understand. "They builded better than they knew." They sometimes spoke with a tongue which they had not learned, and which needed interpretation by another, 1 Cor. 14:28. (3) It is strongly suggested by the words, "thus saith the Lord," with which they so often preface their messages. (4) It is favored by the words of Paul in 2 Tim. 2:16, which recognize Scripture itself as *theopneustic* or *God-inspired.* But Scripture is merely God's word, written instead of spoken, and the inspiration must relate to the word which is written rather than to the act of writing, the penmanship.

Objections to plenary verbal inspiration considered.

The theory of plenary *verbal* inspiration has been opposed on the ground, (1) That it does not account for the varieties of style which distinguish the biblical writers. The style of Paul differs from that of John, the style of Isaiah from that of Ezekiel, the style of Hosea from that of Joel, and so on. Every writer differs in this respect from every other. Yet this objection is not conclusive, for the Spirit of inspiration may have suggested to each writer such words and idoms, and such only, as the writer was accustomed to use. It would have been as easy for the Spirit to do this as to suggest Greek words to a Greek or Hebrew words to a Hebrew. Yet the more

Inspired the Bible"; *Elliott* (C.), "Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures"; *Horton* (R. F.), "Inspiration of the Bible"; *Smeaton* (G.), "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," Lect. III.

obvious explanation is that every writer freely chose the words which he employed.

(2) That it scarcely agrees with the emotional and even passionate language sometimes used by biblical writers. Expressions of fear or despair, of anger or bitterness, of jealousy or revenge, are occasionally met with which do not seem to be naturally due to action of the Holy Spirit. To suppose that a record of such feelings was dictated by the Spirit of God, after they had passed away from the writer's soul, is less satisfactory than to suppose that they were expressed with rapid pen while still throbbing in his spirit.

(3) That it seems to belittle the work of prophets and apostles in teaching the will of God. It represents them as instruments rather than intelligent agents, as men possessed and controlled by the Spirit of God, but contributing little or nothing to the work by their own activity. It often exhibits inspired men as speaking and writing in a state of ecstasy, scarcely knowing what they do. But we may safely assume that God never interferes with the moral agency of his servants. The supernatural does not supersede the natural, nor the mechanical the vital, in his reign of grace.

2. The *second* theory, that of plenary *dynamical* inspiration,[1] supposes that the Spirit of God invigorated the spiritual powers of men who were called to receive and teach divine truth. It was an influence which empowered the soul to see and announce the thoughts of God. It moved, but did not compel the prophet or apostle to teach what had been revealed to him. It affected the person

[1] See *Lee* (W.), "The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; its Nature and Proof"; *Row* (C. A.), "The Nature and Extent of Divine Inspiration, as stated by the Writers and deduced from the Facts of the New Testament"; *Cave* (A.), "The Inspiration of the Old Testament Inductively Considered"; *Warington* (G.), "The Inspiration of Scripture; Its Limits and Effects."

inspired directly, and his work indirectly. Several arguments are alleged in support of this theory.

(1) It conceives of inspiration as a moral process, an influence of Spirit upon spirit. The mechanical aspect of the first theory nowhere appears. The man of God is stimulated, encouraged; all his spiritual capacities are set at work, — reason, conscience, sensibility, and will. The qualities of his character, the pecularities of his discipline and experience, his temperament, his energy, all appear in his work, yet under the influence of the divine Spirit.

(2) It accords with a broad and correct view of the purpose of revelation, *viz.*, that it was given to restore men to fellowship with God, and not merely to instruct them in morals and religion. Hence it appeals to their hopes, their fears, their sense of moral obligation, their gratitude for love and kindness, their sympathy with high ideals, that they may be moved to enter on a new life; hence, too, its abounding and affecting utterances of religious feeling, its penitential psalms, its grateful and exulting songs. The letters of Paul, for example, are alive with Christian experience, and aglow with spiritual hope and love. It is not cold accuracy or the dry light of reason that is needed to overcome the selfishness of the human heart, but the testimony of life and love; it is God speaking to men of his holiness and grace as these are shed abroad in the hearts of his children, and fervently expressed by their words. This is provided for by the dynamical theory of inspiration.

(3) It allows us to hold that an inspired writer could appropriate, and, by so doing, ratify the words of an ordinary annalist. The original authorship of any paragraph, chapter, or book is of no consequence, provided it has been approved by a mind thus inspired. The authority of Scripture does not depend on its origin, but on its character. It is therefore immaterial, how freely the

author of 1 and 2 Kings adopted the language of his sources, or how much of his Gospel Luke borrowed from written narratives that have since perished.

(4) It lends itself readily to a convenient distinction between inspiration and revelation: *inspiration* being applied to the work of the Spirit in qualifying a prophet or apostle to apprehend and declare the truth which is given him by *revelation.* The works of nature or the ministry of Jesus Christ may be a revelation of divine truth to one who is empowered to receive it by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This distinction is favorable to clearness of thought, especially when we compare the teaching of Christ, by which truth was brought to the minds of his disciples, with the work of the Spirit enabling them to recall that teaching and convey it to others.

But the second theory as now stated, that of plenary *dynamical* inspiration, assumes that the secular history of the Bible is as truthworthy as its religious teaching; or in other words, that the sacred writers meant to teach secular history as truly and in the same sense as they meant to teach the relation of God to men and of men to God. This theory, however, is believed by many to be inconsistent with the character of the sacred writings and the claims of their writers. For those writings are said to contain many historical and possibly scientific errors, while they claim to teach nothing but moral and religious truth.

3. Hence the theory of *religious dynamical* inspiration, which supposes that chosen men were empowered by the inbreathing and influence of the Holy Spirit *to apprehend and teach religious truth without error.*

In support of this theory it is said,

(1) That a careful study of the Scriptures warrants the assertion that the *purpose* of every book of the Bible is really religious. It is the relations between God and man that these books aim to reveal and emphasize. The

relations of man to man are treated as of secondary importance. No attempt is made to chronicle discoveries or inventions, to point out the human causes of national order and prosperity, or to illustrate the progress of literature and knowledge. Changes are noted because the hand of God is seen in them. Calamities are traced to his displeasure with the people, and his displeasure with the people is traced to their sins. The law is sacred, because it was given by Jehovah.[1] The problems discussed, the questions answered, are essentially religious, — not scientific, or governmental, or historical.

The only books which appear to have a less definite religious aim are Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, according to the prevalent modern interpretation, and parts of Proverbs. No other book of the Old Testament can be added to this list, unless it be Ruth, and it is easy to discover a religious purpose and lesson in that beautiful story. The same is true, to some extent, of Ecclesiastes. And in every book of the New Testament the religious element is pervasive and dominant.

(2) An examination of the biblical passages relating to inspiration leads to the belief that it was an endowment to qualify men for the work of religious teaching. When Jesus promised his Apostles the Spirit of truth, he defined the work of that Spirit as embracing the following particulars: bringing to their remembrance the words of Christ, taking from Christ and imparting to them the things of Christ, revealing to them the things to come, guiding them into all the truth, and assisting them to speak wisely for themselves and for him before unfriendly tribunals. Every item in this promise relates to the Kingdom of God. "The things to come" are evidently things pertaining to that Kingdom. "All the truth" means Christian truth, without any reference to natural science or secular history. Jesus came into the

[1] See Psalms 1, 19, 119.

world to seek and to save that which was lost, and the Holy Spirit was promised to carry on his work. No other view of the promise is exegetically defensible.

The same limit to the scope of inspiration is to be found in Paul's language, 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; "Every Scripture [being] inspired by God, is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." For obviously the designation, "man of God," here signifies a religious teacher, like Timothy, and more definitely still a preacher of the Gospel.

Hence, too, the expression, "every good work," must mean everything which a faithful preacher of the Gospel was called to do in accomplishing his ministry. It does not affirm that the Old Testament Scriptures were particularly useful in fitting men to be Roman consuls or generals or lawyers. Such kinds of work were not in the writer's mind.

A study of other passages would not modify the conclusion which we draw from these. There is probably no statement of Scripture concerning prophets, apostles, or sacred writers, which, fairly interpreted, implies that they were inspired in order to qualify them for any kind of teaching which did not pertain to religion. Compare Rom. 2:18, 20; 3:2, 19, 21; 7:12; 9:4; 1 Pet. 1:10-12, 23; 4:11; 2 Pet. 1:19-21; 3:2, 13; Heb. 2:2, 6, 8; 10:1; 11:13.

If now the *purpose* of inspiration may be used by us to define the sphere of illumination in the mind of man by the Holy Spirit, it will be right for us to take account of this in our judgment as to the inerrancy of Scripture. For if it is possible to show that there are narratives or other statements in the Bible which can be discriminated from its religious teaching, and the accuracy or inaccuracy of which would not affect the character of that

teaching, this should be considered when we predicate infallibility of the Word of God. Dynamical inspiration is not of necessity plenary inspiration. And it is perhaps almost as dangerous to piety to overestimate the divine, as it is to overestimate the human quality of the sacred record. This will appear when we undertake to answer the objections to the alleged inerrancy of Scripture in all its statements. Some of these objections will predispose us to look with favor on the theory of *religious* inspiration, that is, inspiration so far as religious teaching is concerned.

4. But there are many scholars at the present time who prefer the *fourth* theory that of *gracious* inspiration, which asserts *that all renewed men are inspired in the same way and for the same purpose,* having through the influence of the Holy Spirit a knowledge of Christian truth in exact proportion to their personal sanctification. The effect of this theory is not to raise the authority of all pious men as teachers of Christian truth, but to lower the authority of Apostles and sacred writers. It levels downward rather than upward. But it is defended by the following arguments: (1) That the same Spirit dwells and works in the hearts of all Christians, 1 Cor. 3:16, and it is presumable that he works after the same manner in all. If so, that working includes spiritual illumination, Eph. 5:8, and doubtless in proportion to inward holiness. (2) That the prediction of Joel and the promise of Christ refer to all true believers, Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:15-21; John 4:14; 7:38, 39; 1 John 2:20.

There is a measure of truth in this interpretation of the passages referred to, and the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit in all Christians may not improperly be called inspiration. Yet the word has been long used to signify a special charism, or work of the Holy Spirit, empowering men to receive and communicate religious

truth with authority, and there is nothing in the passages quoted to show that the same kind of gifts were imparted to all. Some of the passages, indeed, suggest a variety of gifts. That there was a variety is clearly asserted by the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 12: 5-11, 28-31. Especially does he enlarge upon the gift of tongues as differing from that of prophecy, and inferior to it, 1 Cor. 14: 1-25. Dorner treats this subject ably:

"We do not give the name of inspired men in the stricter sense to those who are made partakers of internal revelation in the Spirit of God merely by the mediation of others.... They who receive a revelation through a primordial act on God's part,... above all, the men, who by revelation mark a new stage in religion, — such as Abraham, Moses, Elijah, the prophets, and the Apostles, — stand in a unique position. For only then is revelation really given to humanity, and therefore made historical fact, when a pure, unerring knowledge of it is imparted to those to whom it is first made, and on whose pure announcement its continuance depends."

Dr. Alfred Cave in his "Inspiration of the Old Testament" (pp. 418, 419) remarks:

"The Books of the Law, as has been seen, present us with a record of the progress of Divine revelation from Adam to Moses; the Books of the Prophets, again, present us with a record of Divine revelation from Moses to Malachi; whereas the Holy Writings (Hagiographa) *present us with a record* not of revelation, but *of the assimilation of revelation*.... Just because these books do not confront us with objective revelation they are invaluable. Their preciousness, their pricelessness, lies in their subjective qualities. These books mirror life in God. They rather reflect man as influenced by what he knows of Deity than God as moved by what He knows of man."

This is suggestive, showing that inspiration is not restricted to those who are bearers of revelation. But Dr. Cave carries analysis too far when he distinguishes

between Hagiographic inspiration, Prophetic inspiration, Transcriptive inspiration, and Canonic inspiration.[1]

Notwithstanding the acceptance which the last theory finds among the thoughtful men who shrink from everything which cannot be verified by present experience, we are compelled to reject it, as irreconcilable with the whole tenor of Scripture, and especially with the unambiguous teaching of Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians. A careful study of the facts appears to us to warrant the following statement:[2]

"The sacred Scriptures, rightly interpreted from beginning to end as the record of a progressive revelation of God to man, of man to himself, and of spiritual life to all who will accept it, will lead to truth without error, and will justify that revelation as one that gave to those addressed by it, in each particular age, the religious truth most needed by them, in the best available form for reaching the heart and purifying the life."[2]

Such a record can be accounted for only by supposing that those who made it were under the quickening and guiding influence of God's spirit, which kept them from error in their religious teaching, and enabled them to declare the truth with persuasive speech.

In view of what has been stated, we claim that the *dynamic* theory of inspiration within the sphere of religious teaching accounts for all the phenomena of the Bible better than any other—for its varieties of style and methods in teaching, for its verbal discrepancies and essential harmony, for the personal feelings and tastes revealed in its language, and for a thousand indications of free spiritual action on the part of its writers. How any one can read the New Testament, the Book of Revelation excepted, and doubt whether its writers speak

[1] Lecture VIII., pp. 417-455.

[2] "Studies in Ethics and Religion," p. 212.

with conscious freedom, and also with conscious authority, passes our comprehension. The letters of Paul are intensely *natural* and equally *supernatural:* the Word was made flesh without losing its heavenly truth and power.

Objections answered

But objections worthy of notice have been pressed against this view of the Bible.

1. *That a belief in the supreme authority of the Bible in matters of religion leads to bibliolatry.*

This must be an error, for the student of nature believes her teaching to be infallible, but is not led by this belief to pay religious homage to nature. In like manner, those who accept the teaching of the Bible as strictly true and final, are led by that very teaching to worship God only. It is doubtless true that certain men are predisposed to a feeling of reverence for persons and places and objects connected with religion. Their church, their pastor, their Bible, their prayer book, the pulpit, the elements of the holy supper, water from the Jordan, the cross, and other material things are treated as sacred. But the higher one puts the authority of the Bible as a revelation from God, the more steadfastly must he refuse to worship anything but God, looking upon the Scriptures, as he does upon nature, as only a mirror revealing to him the sole object of worship.

2. *That this belief concerning the Bible retards the progress of science.* Men are rendered by it suspicious of the discoveries of science, and hostile to new views of nature or of man.

There is without doubt plausible evidence of this charge. Believers in the truth of Scripture are slow to receive scientific theories which appear to be inconsistent with what they suppose the Bible teaches. But they are friends of knowledge, interested in studying the works of

God in nature, and founders as well as patrons of the highest schools of learning. Elaborate treatises have been written to prove that Christian theology, and indeed a belief in the supernatural, is sternly antagonistic to the free ways of science and the successful search for truth; but anything can be proved by culling facts and using them for a purpose, and we think that these volumes are examples of both processes. At all events, the natural sciences flourish best in Christian nations, and true religion stimulates study of the works of God.

It may, however, be granted that a misapprehension of what the Bible was given to teach, or a misinterpretation of some of its language, has sometimes led to needless controversy between scientists and theologians. But this controversy has more than once been provoked by the rash hypotheses or anti-Christian spirit of naturalists, and in the end it has probably been of service to biblical interpretation and to natural science as well.[1]

3. *That this belief concerning the Bible requires us to suppose that all copies, translations, and even interpretations of its religious teaching should be inspired and inerrant.* For otherwise, it is said, the benefit of inerrancy would be lost to all but the primitive readers.

We cannot see the force of this objection. For errors arising from transcription, translation, or interpretation can be detected by patient scrutiny, and then reduced to a *minimum,* or wholly removed; but errors in the original text could neither be measured nor corrected. This will be evident, upon reflection, to every one who is familiar with the processes of textual criticism.

Suppose a prescription for a fatal disease, made by the only physician who understood the disease and its remedy, were taken down by his servant under his eyes, but, after his death, which soon occurred, were tran-

[1] *Draper* (W.), "History of the Conflict between Religion and Science"; *White* (A. D)., "The Warfare of Science."

scribed by many others, until the copies differed more or less from one another, — would any person say that errors in the copies would be as damaging to confidence as errors in the original? By comparing the different copies, it would be possible to restore the original. But if there had been errors in that, how could they be discovered or corrected?

At the same time it must be admitted that minor errors in the original prescription might not render it absolutely worthless. Errors, *e. g.,* in respect to the date of the first use of the medicine, if that were mentioned, or in respect to the exact weight of the less important ingredients, or in respect to the frequency with which the specific should be administered, might exist without destroying the virtue of the remedy. In like manner, no one can say that a tincture of error in the religious teaching of prophets and apostles would have rendered inefficient all the truth which they proclaimed. But if we had no tests by which to determine the comparative amount of error and the nature of its action along with the truth, our confidence in biblical teaching would be shaken, if not destroyed. We should feel the need of some higher standard in ourselves, some Christian consciousness that might be trusted to guide us in separating the precious from the vile. Have we this? How can we know that we have it?

4. *That the Bible has much obscure language, — much that is hard to be understood.* But the object of a supernatural revelation must be to make known important truth; and, therefore, words will be used, not to hide, but to express thought so that we have a right to expect the clearest language possible.

This objection is plausible, but without convincing force. (1) For, in the *first* place, the supreme object of revelation is to bring men into loving union with God. Truth must therefore be revealed in such a way as to

arouse their attention and move their hearts. The manner of making it known is accordingly of highest importance. Account must be taken in this of the whole spiritual condition of mankind, especially of the people first addressed.

(2) In the *second* place, the Scriptures are admirably fitted to fix and hold the attention of men, in their fallen state, on religious truth. This is shown by their history. It may also be accounted for by their contents. For truth as recorded in the Bible was made known from time to time in fragments, here a little and there a little, as prophets and the people were able to receive it. It appeared as stars in a cloudy night. To be sure the knowledge of prophets must have been in advance not only of the spiritual state of the world outside of them, but also of their own moral and religious experience;[1] but not too far in advance. There must be reception as well as communication. The divine message must be adapted to the human organ. So we have fragments of history, of biography, and of doctrine, — clarity set in obscurity, the best possible revelation for men as they were.

(3) Hence, in the *third* place, the revelation was originally progressive, and the record of it, if historical, must be progressive also. Such it is in fact; its method is educational, full of life and hope, exciting curiosity, rewarding inquiry like the book of nature, and preparing men to appreciate truth by inducing them to search for it. Sacred history and biography from Moses to Herod, from Adam to Jesus Christ, illustrate this method and process. And the disclosure of purely religious truth follows the same course. But this course involves obscurity, knowing in part, and perpetual effort to comprehend the past and foresee the future.

(4) There is, besides, a transcendent element in the Bible. As a religious book it is concerned with the re-

[1] See *Dorner*, II., p. 195.

lations of God to man, of the Unseen and Infinite to the seen and finite. Extraordinary events must be described in ordinary language, and put before the mind in connection with ordinary events. The realities of spiritual life must be expressed in terms of natural life. Hence figurative language will pervade the record, and the figures employed will be those most intelligible and impressive to the men who from time to time receive the revelation and deliver it to the people. But that which is the most luminous symbolism for truth in one age may be darker to another. More or less of obscurity will be inevitable in speaking of the movements of an Infinite Spirit in the realm of finite beings, but that obscurity will be increased when the language of an early people is the vehicle of instruction and appeal to another and far later people.

(5) Here, too, must we place our vindication of the use of parables, allegories, fables and, if they occur, mythical representations of great crises in human history. So unreasonable a view of the presence of myths in the Bible has been advocated by certain rationalistic critics, that we are possibly in danger of denying the service which they might be made to render by the Spirit of God in impressing upon minds at a certain stage of culture essential truth. We believe they are used very rarely, if at all, by the sacred writers, but we cannot, on general principles, deny that they might be safely used. The same may be said of almost every species of literature. Hyperbole and irony are not uncommon to some parts of the Bible. Every honest method of appealing to taste, imagination, curiosity, fear, hope, conscience, reverence, is resorted to for the purpose of saving men from sin and death.

(6) At the same time it is always to be remembered that the necessity of searching for hidden treasures prepares the mind to appreciate the treasures when found.

It is well that there is no easy road to knowledge, for, if there were, knowledge would soon be despised. Parables are sometimes better than demonstration, Luke 8: 10 and parallel texts. Even fables may be a vehicle of truth, Judges 9: 8-16.

5. *That the Scriptures sometimes use unsound arguments, a fact which is inconsistent with their religious inspiration.* The leading ideas of Christianity may have been revealed to the sacred writers, it is said, but the subordinate ideas and the arguments employed must have been the fruit of their unaided reason, and therefore in no true sense from God. This is applicable even to the words of Jesus, as reported by the evangelists, and still more to the words of Paul, Matt. 22: 29-33; Luke 20: 34-38; Gal. 3: 16.

(1) On the contrary, we believe that neither Christ nor his Apostles can be shown to have argued sophistically. They may not indeed have always stated their argument fully; few men do that in actual life. It is enough for them to suggest one or more of the premises; their hearers do the rest. This is, no doubt, the explanation of Christ's reply to the Sadducees. The root of their unbelief was their denial of a future life, and they seized upon the doctrine of the resurrection as the most vulnerable article in the Pharisaic doctrine of a future life. Jesus, perceiving their *animus*, corrected in the first place their error in respect to the nature of the resurrection body and life. The family relations of time are not to be continued in eternity. Marrying and giving in marriage, birth and death, will cease in the coming æon. So far all is clear. There is no trace of Rabbinic sophistry. But the Saviour next turns the tables upon his critics by appealing to a passage in the Pentateuch for proof of a future life, and, therefore, of a resurrection of the dead. "Have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the

God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of dead men, but of living men." Jesus here assumes that God would not have so revealed and identified himself to Moses, unless his relation to the patriarchs, who were his servants and friends, had been a permanent one, existing at the time when he appeared to Moses. The Sadducees were put to silence, and it was unnecessary for Jesus to justify the assumption underlying his positive argument. How he would have done this, if it had been necessary, we can only conjecture, but we have no reason to suppose that it would have been by unsound arguments.[1]

(2) Again, the language of Paul in Galatians 3: 16 is said to be a piece of mere Rabbinical reasoning, of no value to the sober understanding. And we admit that if the Apostle saw in the exclusive use of the singular form of the word "seed," in several passages of the Old Testament evidence that it pointed to some kind of unity which had its centre and source in Christ, he certainly perceived something more in a particular form of expression than simple scholarship would have been likely to discover, but which it has no right to deny when pointed out. (Compare 1 Sam. 8: 15 for a special use of the word "seed.") Very beautiful is the thought which Paul here expresses. All believers are virtually one person, and that person is Christ, Gal. 3: 28. He is the life of their life. Their faith comes through him and unites them with him. When the nations are blessed it will be because they bless themselves in him. And when the Saviour said, "I am the vine; ye are the branches," he enunciated the same truth.[2]

6. *That the Scriptures are chargeable with false interpretation, and therefore cannot be inspired.* This is one of the weightiest reasons for denying the religious

[1] Compare "Studies in Ethics and Religion," pp. 220, 221.

[2] "Studies in Ethics and Religion," pp. 227, 228.

inspiration of New Testament writers. If they misunderstood the teaching of the Old Testament, what confidence can we have in their teaching of the Christian religion? But when New Testament writers borrow words or sentences from the Old Testament, it is well to ascertain the purpose for which they are borrowed. They may be quoted in proof of certain doctrines or facts; they may be adduced as predictions of certain New Testament events which have now at last taken place; they may be cited as fulfilled afresh in New Testament times, though they had been fulfilled before, perhaps more than once; or they may be appropriated as words fitted to express, in the happiest manner, a thought or feeling which the writer wishes to lodge in the heart and memory of his reader. These are very different uses of Old Testament language, and must be carefully distinguished in answering the objection before us.[1]

It may also be laid down as a rule, to which there can be few exceptions, that we cannot be certain that a New Testament writer misinterprets a passage of the Old Testament, unless we know the meaning of both writers in the passages compared. And surely some of the Old Testament language, which is supposed to be misapplied in the New Testament, is particularly obscure, for instance, Isa. 7: 14; Matt. 1: 22, 23. Indeed, a considerable number of the passages alleged by critics belong to this class of texts.

Again, it is necessary to bear in mind that the present text of the Old Testament in Hebrew is by no means faultless; that the Greek version of it used by New Tes-

[1] Compare *Scott* (J.), "Principles of New Testament Quotation established and applied to Bible Science"; *Johnson* (F.), "The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old"; *Barrows* (E. P.), "The Quotations of the New Testament in their Relation to the Question of Inspiration," Bib. Sac. XXX, pp. 305-322; *Toy* (C. H.), "Quotations in the New Testament."

tament writers was from different hands of unequal skill; that quotations were probably often made from memory, without consulting a manuscript; that words or sentences from different places were sometimes brought together in a New Testament citation, and that a germinant or typical sense was frequently ascribed to Old Testament language: for all these circumstances have to do with our estimate of the interpretations given to the Old Testament by writers of the New. Their task in this respect was a peculiar and somewhat difficult one; for they were to employ the Old Testament with the light shed upon its teaching by the ministry, the death, and the resurrection of Christ and by the work of the Holy Spirit from the Pentecost onwards. And we cannot but think that their free, yet reverent, application of Old Testament language to New Testament realities is in profound harmony with the teleological character of all revelation, and essentially correct.

Hence, it is evident that New Testament writers, or at least some of them, looked upon Old Testament characters, events and ritual services, as being to some extent prophetic of higher Christian realities, shadows of good things to come. All the stages of human discipline, education, and redemption were thought of by them as, under God, correlated and interdependent. A principle of evolution, as well as a law of progress, connects the earlier stages with the later. This should least of all be forgotten by modern interpreters. Is it not really a self-evident principle in training a *race* of moral beings?

7. *That the Scriptures teach scientific errors, and, therefore, cannot be inspired.* These errors are found, it is said, in the biblical account of the creation, of the origin of man and the time of his appearance, of his longevity before the flood, of the connection of angels with women, of the deluge in the days of Noah, and of the astronomical worlds.

As a general reply to this objection, we may insist upon the fact that the sacred writers do not claim to be teachers of science, but of religion. It is their object to trace all things to the voluntary action of God as their first cause. The origination of man, as well as of every other living creature, they ascribe to the purpose and volition of the Almighty. The deluge was not a merely natural phenomenon, taking place without God's foresight and direction as the Ruler of a sinful race. It was rather an expression of his holy will and a warning to sinners.

(1) As to the origin of man, the first chapter of Genesis places it after the production of vegetable and animal life, and the second chapter represents man's body as shaped from preëxisting matter, — saying nothing of the time occupied or of the process employed in moulding the human form, — and his spirit as communicated by the living energy of God. We do not understand the second chapter to affirm that man was created before the existence of inferior life on earth — vegetable or animal. As man is the crown, the culmination, and the reason for all earthly life, his creation is first related, and this is followed by a narrative of the introduction of other beings on which his welfare was conditioned. In other words, the order of thought in the infinite mind is followed in the narrative; namely, first, the end to be reached, and then the means for reaching it. For in rational action the final cause precedes the efficient cause, and efficient causation, through suitable means, provides for the accomplishment of the purpose springing from the final cause.

(2) As to the length of the time which has passed since man appeared on earth, we do not know that the sacred writers meant to furnish any sufficient data. Their chronology of human history before the days of Abraham is confessedly obscure and uncertain. We are

not sure that they intended to give a chronology that would cover the whole period, without any gaps. This remark applies to the numerical features of the genealogical tables from Adam to Noah, as well as to those which seem at first sight to bridge the chasm between Noah and Abraham. Conservative critics, like Dr. Green of Princeton, admit the correctness of this statement. The extraordinary longevity of men before the flood, according to the genealogical tables of the fifth chapter of Genesis, awakens suspicion of something not yet explained in the character of the record. *Non liquet.*[1]

(3) As to the passage which is said by many able scholars to affirm the practice of sexual intercourse between angels and women, another interpretation of its meaning is reasonable. While it is true that some of the later Jews imagined the words to be a reminiscence of superhuman sensuality and sin, working disaster to mankind, and while there is a sentence in Jude which may easily be supposed to imply the same thing, the monstrosity of the conduct described, on that hypothesis, justifies a rejection of it by every ingenuous critic, so long as any other interpretation is defensible. And such an interpretation is possible.[2] It is, in brief, that the writer means by "the sons of God," worshippers of the true God, and by "the daughters of men," daughters of the irreligious but ambitious and prosperous family of Cain.

(4) As to the narrative of a universal deluge, there is no certain evidence that the sacred writer meant to affirm anything more than a submergence of the known world in water, with the destruction of all land animals, except those that were preserved in the ark. Against

[1] See *Crawford* (T. P.), "The Patriarchal Dynasties from Adam to Abraham." Interesting and suggestive, if not fully convincing.

[2] See "Doctrine of Angels," *infra.*

this view of its meaning science has offered no conclusive objection. The indications that the narrative is a compilation from two earlier narratives, each of which was simple and self-consistent while the compilation is repetitious and self-contradictory, are sufficient to justify the most painstaking inquiry, though the result of this inquiry would not seriously affect the historical value of the narrative. It would, however, not stand by itself, but would inevitably be associated with the view that is taken of the composition of the Hexateuch and of several other parts of the Old Testament. And if the hypothesis of compilation on a large scale is adopted, two things will have to be assumed: a. a remarkable linguistic and historical self-consistency in the original documents, and b. an equally remarkable indifference to logical coherence or historical self-consistency in the final compilation.

(5) As to the other point, the manner in which the sky is spoken of as a solid firmament, having windows that can be opened for the outpouring of rain, we can only say that the language seems to us figurative and phenomenal, not intended to teach what is alleged. In his "American Notes" (p. 72), Charles Dickens, describing a prairie sunset, uses the following language: "The decline of day here was very gorgeous, tinging the firmament deeply with red and gold up to the very keystone of the arch above us." Had this passage been found in Genesis, there are critics who would conclude that the sacred writer believed the expanse above our heads a piece of solid masonry — a hollow sphere of stone. Is not the *keystone* mentioned? And what better evidence can be desired that the writer meant to speak the literal truth about the sky?

8. *That the Scriptures teach historical errors, and therefore cannot be inspired.*

Before referring to any specimen of these errors, two

remarks are in place: (1) They are supposed to be more numerous in the Old Testament than in the New. In other words, those portions of sacred history which can be most fully tested by means of profane history, are found to be singularly trustworthy — almost every year bringing to light confirmations of their truthfulness. (2) The alleged errors relate, for the most part, to dates, numbers, and names, or to minor, non-essential features of the history. Anachronisms, numerical exaggerations, chronological and genealogical mistakes and duplicated stories are affirmed to be so many and so plain that it is useless to attempt any defence of biblical history. But it deserves to be borne in mind that numerical errors are more likely than any others to be introduced by transcribers, that round numbers are sometimes used for exact numbers, that persons frequently have more than one name, or different persons have the same name, that words and sentences are occasionally inserted by a later hand, and that many stories may not be duplicated though they are said to be.

An example of the alleged anachronisms of the Bible may be found in Acts 5: 36, "For before these days rose up Theudas," etc. Josephus, it is affirmed, places the insurrection of Theudas some ten years after the delivery of this speech; hence, Gamaliel could not have used the language here ascribed to him by Luke. But to this criticism it has been replied that there may have been more than one insurgent by the name of Theudas in that turbulent period, or that Luke's Theudas may have been identical with one of the four insurgents to each of whom Josephus gives the name Simon. Several of the Apostles had at least two distinct names, and it is not improbable that Theudas had another name.

In 1 Sam. 6: 19, "And he [*i. e.*, God] smote the men of Beth-Shemesh, because they had looked into the Ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand

and three score and ten men" (50,070), there is doubtless a numerical error, an error of exaggeration. It seems incredible that so many people dwelt in Beth-Shemesh. For, according to all other notices of this place in the Bible, it was a small town, with perhaps five or ten thousand inhabitants. An error has probably crept into the text from a marginal gloss. Thenius pronounces the collocation of the Hebrew numerals to be "unheard of," and supposes that a mistake was made in writing the marginal gloss.[1] Josephus says that seventy men were smitten (Ant. vi. 4), and this may be the actual number, though how he obtained it is unknown.

The genealogies of Jesus the Christ, by Matthew and Luke, have been pronounced inconsistent with each other and therefore untrustworthy; for example, an error is detected in Matthew's assertion that there were three series of fourteen generations each, from Abraham to Jesus, whereas one of these lists has only thirteen names. But, inspiration aside, it is scarcely credible that Matthew, the publican, made a mistake in counting fourteen, and that no one of his fellow-disciples observed the error and secured its correction. Besides, there is no great difficulty in filling out the three groups. The first begins with Abraham and ends with David, counting both. The second begins with David ("from David") and ends with "the carrying away into Babylon," though not including the persons carried away. After "the carrying away" the list begins with Jechoniah and ends with Jesus. It is said to have been a common practice with the Jews to distribute genealogies in this way, repeating or leaving out some names in order to secure symmetry in numbers.[2]

[1] Compare *Warington* on "The Inspiration of the Scriptures," p. 201 f.

[2] For other criticisms of the genealogy of Christ, see *Robinson's* (E.) "Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek," p. 183 f.;

L of C.

But it ought, perhaps, to be said, that a genealogy, in order to be of any value to men in the time of Christ, must have been copied without change from public or family archives. Any change in its contents would have diminished its value, even though the change had been an improvement in fullness or exactness. Its practical utility would depend on its agreement with extant records. For the purpose which it was meant to serve in the sacred writings, its imperfection was necessary to its perfection. Any improvement made by an evangelist would have exposed it to suspicion. But the Spirit of inspiration was a Spirit of wisdom, intent upon preserving the essential truth, though it must be in an earthen vessel. The inspired writer can only be held responsible for its trustworthiness as a proof of Christ's descent from David and Abraham.

9. *That the Scriptures abound in contradictory statements, and therefore cannot be inspired.* Many pages could be filled with sentences from the Bible which seem to be contradictory, but which further reflection will show to be consistent with one another. For example, (1) statements may be contradictory in words, but not in sense. Thus Prov. 26: 4, 5, "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes." In other words, Be wise in your treatment even of fools, adapting your conduct to theirs in such a way as to rebuke their conceit without becoming like them. Act reasonably always, but not in the same way always, for differing circumstances require different action.

(2) Statements may seem to be contradictory in sense when they are not. For instance, Paul insists that a man is justified by faith and not by works, while James declares that a man is justified by works, and not by faith

Hervey (A. C.), "Genealogies of our Lord Jesus Christ"; "Genealogy of Christ," *Smith's* (B. D.).

only. But Paul means by faith a faith that works by love, and James means by works a service of God which springs from faith. In like manner Jesus affirms, "I and my Father are one," and in another connection, "My Father is greater than I." There is a profound unity of nature which makes the Father and the Son one, but there was a distinction of condition which then separated them, and there is a distinction of personality which always separates them. Thus the Trinitarian affirms the unity of God in one respect and his triunity in another.

(3) Statements may be contradictory in sense, but not in moral bearing. For example, rest from labor on the Sabbath was enjoined upon all the Israelites, but in the same law extra service was required of the priests. In other words, all were told to rest on the Sabbath, and a certain part of the people was forbidden to rest from its wonted labor on that day. But it will be remembered that the people were to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. And in keeping it holy they were to worship God as well as to rest from ordinary labor. The end of both provisions of the law was the highest good of the people, physical, moral, and religious.

(4) Finally, the statements of Moses and those of Jesus concerning divorce seem to be contradictory, and are so in their immediate operation, but not in their moral bearing. Deut. 24: 1-4; Math. 19: 3-9. Both were intended to increase the sacredness of the marriage tie; but, owing to the state of society in the time of Moses, the civil law was made less stringent than the rule which Jesus laid down for his people and reign.

If these explanations are properly weighed and the general fact of the progressive method of revelation is at the same time duly considered, the alleged contradictions of Scripture will rapidly disappear, and the marvellous unity of spirit and teaching will rise into view.

Concession

Yet it is beyond question true that many numerical contradictions have crept into the text of the Old Testament through the oversight of copyists. See 2 Sam. 24:9; 1 Chron. 21:5; 2 Sam. 24:24; 1 Chron. 21:25; 2 Sam. 23:8; 1 Chron. 11:11; 2 Sam. 8:4; 1 Chron. 18:4; 2 Sam. 10:18; 1 Chron. 19:18; 1 Kings 9:28; 2 Chron. 8:18; 2 Kings 8:26; 2 Chron. 22:2; 2 Kings 24:8; 2 Chron. 36:9; Ezra 2:69; Neh. 7:72.[1]

There are obvious reasons why it is peculiarly difficult to avoid errors in the transcription of numbers. Nothing short of a perpetual miracle would have prevented them.

10. *That the Scriptures contain numerous false predictions, and therefore cannot be inspired.*

In reply to this objection, we are justified in urging two facts. (1) That, from the nature of the case, prediction must be more obscure than almost any other kind of writing. If it were possible to describe future events as minutely and accurately as past events, it would be certainly undesirable to do so. No good would come of it, and it would be likely to result in fatalistic indifference, or in heaven-daring opposition to the divine will. (2) That prophecy relating to the future is sometimes expressly and sometimes tacitly conditional, Deut. 30:10 f.; Jer. 18:7-10; 26:2 f.; 36:2, 3; Jonah 4:2. This is so generally the case, that an objection to the divine authority or inspiration of Scripture founded upon the non-fulfillment of prophecy must be pronounced worthless. We can hardly account for the respect which some have shown to this objection.

[1] *Haley* (J. W.), "An Examination of the Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible" contains valuable suggestions on this part of our subject; see p. 38 f.

11. *That the Scriptures teach bad morality, and therefore, cannot be inspired.*[1]

Deception, treachery, revenge, and cruelty are thought to be approved either in explicit terms or by speaking well of men who practise them. The same is said to be true of polygamy, concubinage, free divorce, and slavery, 1 Sam. 16:2; 2 Kings 8:11; — Judges 4:18-21; 5:24-27; — 1 Sam. 15:2, 3; Ex. 21:24, 25; Deut. 19:21; — 2 Sam. 12:31; 1 Chron. 20:3; — Gen. 29:21 f.; 30:1 f.; Deut. 24:1-4; Lev. 26:39-46. But several points are to be closely examined before we accept this statement as just to the Scriptures.

(1) *One* is, the progressive, educational method of revelation. If that method is necessary or wise in view of man's nature, it will not do to deny its applicability to practical morals as well as to religion. The standard of outward action is not the same for a child as for a man, for a barbarian as for a Greek. In the childhood of religion rougher manners are tolerable than should be suffered at a later stage.

(2) *Another* is, the impossibility in many cases of determining the real moral quality of actions. Only God can do this perfectly; and he looks not at the outward appearance, but at the heart. It is more than possible that the terrible act of Jael was the issue of intense loyalty to the God of Israel. Men are judged righteously when their purpose and motive and knowledge are taken into account. And, therefore, while the foundations of moral conduct are forever the same, the structures built

[1] *Bruce* (W. S.), "The Ethics of the Old Testament"; *Hessey* (J. A.), "Moral Difficulties of the Bible," First and Second Series; *Edwards* (B. B.), "Imprecations in the Scriptures," Bib. Sac. XIII., pp. 551-563; *Park* (E. A.), "Imprecatory Psalms," Bib. Sac. XIX., pp. 165-210; *Warington* (G.), "The Inspiration of Scripture; its Limits and Effects," p. 242 ff.; the discussion of Mr. Warington, though brief, is very much to the point.

on those foundations may be various in the various conditions of mankind.

(3) Still *another* is, that silence does not always mean approbation. Even temporary permission does not signify indorsement for all time. God permitted an easy but regulated way of divorce under the law of Moses, although it did not accord with the original norm of marriage, but only tended to prepare the people for a return to that ideal norm. This was the thing that could then be done by civil processes, and the perfect Teacher does not condemn it as a temporary rule. So of slavery. It was regulated and mitigated, but not directly forbidden. Such a view of God and of man was taught as would in the end reveal the evils of slavery and lead to its cessation. God was pleased to work by slow processes. The root of the evil was in the selfishness of man, and the evil could not be effectually removed without destroying its root. The Bible is constructed on the plan of making the tree good, in order to make the fruit good. It plants the seed of true virtue in the centre of the soul, that it may work from within outwardly. This is often a slow process, but it is the only sure one. And it is through and through merciful as well as moral. But if permission does not always imply approval, much less does silence. The Bible faithfully describes many evil deeds, without formally condemning them. Yet it is often found to condemn them informally by narrating their dreadful consequences. Witness the story of David after his atrocious sin against Bathsheba and Uriah.

12. *That the Scriptures teach bad theology, and therefore cannot be inspired.*

In particular it is averred that God is represented in the Bible as changeful, jealous, revengeful, and altogether human, Gen. 6:6; Num. 23:19; 1 Sam. 15:11, 29; 2 Sam. 24:16; Mal. 3:16; James 1:17;

— Ex. 20:5; 34:14; Ezek. 39:25; Zech. 1:14; 1 Cor. 10:22; Deut. 32:35; Heb. 10:30; Isa. 59:17; 63:4; Rom. 3:5; 12:19. These passages, if they were the only ones revealing the character of God, might signify just the same when applied to him as they do when applied to men. But they are not the only passages which speak of his character. They are overbalanced by others so clear that we are constrained to eliminate from the words "repent," "be jealous," and "take vengeance," every tincture of the narrowness or bitterness which we condemn in men. We are reminded by such texts of the imperfection of human language and the limits of human thought when applied to God.

But we must also remember, while reading them, the ends sought by revelation, ends which go far to determine its style. For the proximate ends of revelation are instruction and *impression,* with a view to the ultimate end, the restoration of men to fellowship with God. Stupid and hardened sinners must be moved, in order to be saved. Hence the feeling of a holy God must be made real to their minds. And this can only be done by casting it, as it were, into the molds of human feeling. But human feeling changes with the changing characters of those who excite it. And, therefore, for the sake of impression, the eternal opposition of God to sinful conduct is represented in the same way, that is, as coming into existence along with the sinful conduct which it antagonizes. Metaphysical accuracy is sacrificed in behalf of moral truth. Perhaps we ought to say that an absolutely correct metaphysical idea of God is above the grasp of finite reason.

The result of our investigation is *that the Bible is a trustworthy revelation of God,* i.e., *of his being, his character, and his relation to other beings, especially men.* It can be appealed to with the same confidence with which we appeal to the order of nature. The testimony which

it bears to the personality and the moral perfection of God is particularly emphatic. And by the Scriptures alone has God given to us a clear revelation of his trinal personality, of his infinite mercy, and of his provision for the restoration of sinners to his favor and life eternal. In our further study of theism we shall therefore make free use of the Holy Scriptures.

CHAPTER III

RESULTANT DOCTRINE OF GOD

GUIDED, then, by the Holy Scriptures, as well as by the intuitions and moral and religious needs of our own souls, we must believe:

I. That God is a Living and Morally Perfect Being

As such he is often called the living God and holy. Passages are numerous both in the Old Testament and the New which characterize him in this way. Lev. 19:2; 20:7; 1 Sam. 2:2; 26:16; Isa. 6:3; John 5:26; 1 Pet. 2:4.

1. But a morally perfect being must have a *perfect intellect* which insures in action *perfect knowledge.* In other words, he must be *omniscient.* For more is meant by moral perfection than mere freedom from sin, or intentional wrongdoing; it means absolutely right feeling, purpose, and conduct in all possible conditions from eternity to eternity; and nothing short of perfect knowledge can insure this.

(1) Notice the language of Scripture, 1 Kings 8:39; Ps. 139:2, 11, 12; Jer. 16:17; Luke 16:15; Rom. 8:27; Heb. 4:13; Isa. 42:9; Ex. 3:18 f.; Jer. 1:5; Ps. 139:16; 1 Sam. 23:10-13.

(2) The knowledge of God has been described as intuitive, independent, complete, and timeless. Such knowledge is consistent with a real though derived energy in physical causes, with a real though limited freedom in voluntary causes, and with purpose and election on the

part of God. Such knowledge is consistent with the real action, if such there be, of physical causes, inasmuch as the action of these is understood to be uniform and necessary. It is also in obvious harmony with purpose and election on the part of God, inasmuch as He must be supposed to know what he has purposed to do. In these cases God's knowledge might be perfect though it were strictly foreknowledge. But how can God know what men will do within the limits of their free agency? As far as we can see, this is only possible if the knowledge of God is conceived of as timeless, that is, as looking directly at all events whether past, present, or future, and not as seeing future events in their causes. The problems suggested by this view are, however, exceedingly difficult, and perhaps insoluble.

"God's foreknowledge," says Charnock, "is not, simply considered, the cause of anything. God foreknows things because they will come to pass; but things are not future because he foreknows them... God did not only know our actions but the manner of our actions, that is, that we would do them freely... Man hath a power to do otherwise than that which God foreknows he will do."

And Augustine remarks:

"If God foresees our will, as it is certain that he foresees it, there will therefore be the will, and there cannot be a will if it is not free: therefore this liberty is foreseen by God. Hence his prescience does not destroy my liberty."[1]

2. A morally perfect being must have a perfect *moral judgment* which insures in action *perfect righteousness.*

(1) And the Scriptures teach us that God is such a being, Ps. 11:7; 15:1; 33:5; 45:7; Lev. 19:2; Isa. 6:3; Deut. 32:4; Ps. 97:2; 145:17; Rom. 2:13; 7:12.

(2) It may here be remarked:

[1] "De Libero Arbitrio," L. iii., ch. 3.

that the *justice* of God is his righteousness expressed in moral government: that his righteousness is fundamental and cannot be resolved into any other quality: that his righteousness and benevolence may impel to the same conduct, neither of them being any check to the other: that the words "anger," "fury," "vengeance," etc., do not denote an effervescent feeling in God, but an eternal displeasure with sin; they do not exaggerate God's hostility to moral evil: and that temporal calamities do not prove exceptional guilt: Lu. 13:1-5; Job, *passim.*

3. A morally perfect being must have a *perfect sensibility,* which insures in action perfectly *right feeling and desire.*[1] (1) The Scriptures abound in representations of the love of God and his desire for the welfare of all his creatures: Ps. 57:11; 145:9; 103:11-13; 136:1-26; Isa. 49:14-16; Matt. 5:45; 7:11; Luke 12:7; John 3:16; 1 John 4:8, 18; 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Cor. 13:11; Eze. 18:23; 33:11.

(2) The *grace* of God is his good will exercised towards the guilty or undeserving. The *mercy* of God is his benevolence exercised towards those who are miserable as well as undeserving. The *patience* of God is his benevolence exercised in forbearing to punish the guilty without delay. And the *wisdom* of God is his omniscience, righteousness, and benevolence, seeking the best ends by the use of the best means. Wisdom is often treated as a distinct attribute; but it is easily seen to be a resultant of perfect knowledge, righteousness and benevolence. "Right ends and means make wisdom," and these can and must be chosen by One who is omnis-

[1] *Charnock* (S.), "A Treatise on the Excellence and Attributes of God." An able work on a great theme. *Foster* (R. S.), "God: Nature and Attributes." Good, but popular. *Shedd* (W. G. T.), "Dogmatic Theology"; *Clarke* (W. N.), "Outline of Theology"; *Dorner* (J. A.), "System of Christian Doctrine."

cient and holy. The moral judgment of mankind affirms this unequivocally.

4. A perfect moral being must have a *perfect will,* which insures in action all that *power can do,* under the direction of perfect knowledge, holiness, and love. This is denominated *omnipotence.* The impression made by the language of Scripture on an open mind, is, that God is omnipotent in the sense described. See Matt. 19:26; Luke 1:37; Eph. 3:20; 2 Cor. 6:18; Gen. 18:14; Jer. 27:5; Isa. 40:26; Ps. 136:4; Jer. 32:17; Job 41 *passim.*

5. In all these attributes we have evidence of the *Personality of God.* He is a being who knows, feels, and wills. Every quality of a personal being is predicated of him. How any impartial student could imagine that the Old Testament writers thought of him as nothing but a "stream of influence," a "something, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," is incomprehensible. Moreover, man is said to have been made in the image and likeness of God, and man is our type of a personal being. He possesses self-consciousness and will, and looks upon personal life as the highest kind of life. If there be any that is higher, he has no power to conceive of it.

6. But the Bible goes further, and uses language which supposes God to be, in some true sense of the word, *tripersonal.*

(1) For the New Testament teaches,

a. The deity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit respectively, John 1:1; Acts 5:3, 4.

b. Their mutual knowledge and love, Matt. 11:27; 1 Cor 2:10; Matt. 3:17; John 3:34, 35; 4:34; 5:30; Rom. 8:27.

c. Their distinct yet relative offices, 1 Cor. 12:4-6; Eph. 2:18-20.

In order to recognize clearly the unity as well as

the tripersonality of God, the word "*trinity*" has been adopted as the best available designation for the true God. Some have suggested the propriety of using the word "*triunity*" to denote the ontological or eternal nature of the Godhead, and the word "*trinity*" to denote the manifestation of the Godhead in the work of salvation. The use of the two words with this distinction would be sometimes convenient to theologians, and perhaps in the end favorable to clearness of thought.

Answer to Difficulties

In view of the logical objections raised to this doctrine, it may be remarked, (a) That a distinction may be justly made between what is *above* and what is *against* human reason. A tripersonal being is doubtless above human reason, but we cannot think that it is against that reason. So, too, an infinite being is above but not against reason. Everything which is too high or complex to be understood is above human reason. (b) That there is no manifest contradiction between an assertion that God is one in essence, and an assertion that the essence of God is tripersonal. The powers or functions of a single essence or substance may be manifold. At least there is no absurdity in saying this. (c) The words "person" and "personal" are more or less modified by the unity of the Godhead, and only signify that the distinction contemplated is of a *personal* nature. There is, doubtless, an interpenetration of life and action in the divine trinity impossible to any three human beings, and a unity at the root of the distinctions which cannot be too strongly emphasized.

(2) If the trinity of God is accepted, it assists us to comprehend in some measure his self-sufficiency and his love. By the self-sufficiency of God we mean that he is complete in every respect, having need of nothing addi-

tional to himself for his highest perfection and blessedness. Hence, creation was not necessary to his happiness, was not called for by self-interest, but was an act of love. And by love we mean a social affection, an interest in the well-being of others, or, at least, of another. When we are told that "God is love," and that "he who abides in love abides in God," the word "love" is used in an altruistic sense, which is its ordinary meaning. But this altruistic affection is inconceivable apart from creation, unless there are distinctions of a personal nature in the Godhead. God cannot love, unless he is either bipersonal or tripersonal, or unless he originates finite persons to love. But it is easily conceivable that he can perfectly love an *Alter Ego*, possessing the same spiritual nature as himself. In the face of this *Alter Ego*, he can see manifested all that is fair and good in his own being, and can love that associate of his divinity as he loves himself. And if there is still Another Distinction of a personal nature in the Godhead, we can see that there must be the blessedness of mutual love to a third. Love to another worthy of perfect love, and love in common with another to a third, equally worthy of infinite love, completes the circle, and seems to give a Divine Being sufficient unto himself and to the highest ideal of life.

Speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity, Julius Müller says:

"Its inmost significance is that God has in himself the eternal and wholly adequate object of his love, independent of all relation to the world, John 17:24, 'Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world'; see also verse 5. This requires alike the unity of the essence, and the distinctness of the persons. For without the distinction of persons, without an I and THOU, there could be no love. Again, without the unity of essence there would follow from the love of God a necessary relation to an essence distinct from God. Both are therefore implied in what is said of the

Logos in the beginning of St. John's Gospel, the distinction of persons by the ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν; the unity of essence by the θεὸς ἦν."[1]

II. That God is an Infinite Being or Spirit

Under this proposition will be placed God's natural attributes or modes of existence. By calling him Spirit we mean to affirm that he is mind without the limitations of matter; Ex. 20:4; Ps. 139:7; Isa. 40:25; John 4:24; Rom. 1:20; Col. 1:15; 1 Tim. 1:17. The language of Ps. 139:7, and of John 4:24, appears to account for the omnipresence of God by the fact of his spirituality. There is no evidence that spirit fills any part of space so as to exclude other reality from it, or that the Divine Spirit is in any way conditioned by space.

1. As infinite, God is *independent.* (1) In respect to his *existence,* which is underived and absolute. He is One who has life in himself, Ex. 3:14; John 5:26. (2) In respect to his *knowledge,* which is intuitive and direct, Heb. 4:13, and passages cited under *perfect knowledge* above. (3) In respect to his *action,* which is determined by his own knowledge and will, Gen. 1:1; Acts 17:24. (4) In respect to his *happiness,* Eph. 1:11; 1 Tim. 6:15, 16, which flows in the last analysis from his own action.

2. As infinite, God is *immutable.* He is forever the same in *essence,* in *knowledge,* in *character,* in *purpose,* and in *blessedness,* Ps. 102:28; Isa. 40:28; Mal. 3:6; Heb. 1:12; James 1:17. The obvious meaning of these passages need not be modified on account of other expressions which speak of change in God. The latter are

[1] "The Christian Doctrine of Sin," II., p. 136 f. See *Fairbairn* (A. M.), "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," pp. 392-40; *Gerhart* (E. V.), "Institutes of the Christian Religion," I., p. 434 f.; *Augustine,* "De Trinitate."

adaptations of the infinite to our finite modes of thought. But the idea of God's nature is always realized in himself. This is meant by the adjective *ἀληθινός*, John 17:3; 1 Thess. 1:9; 1 John 5:20; Rev. 6:10.

Some have supposed that God is mutable both in happiness and in action. But does not omniscience preclude fluctuations in feeling? And may we not say that the mode of God's action, though above our understanding, is subjectively timeless? That all his action, *ad extra,* is so united as to be wholly present at once to his consciousness? Perhaps it is better to say with the Psalmist, "*Such* knowledge is too wonderful for me: It is high, I cannot attain unto it," Ps. 139:6.

3. As infinite, God is *eternal.* His existence is without beginning or end. In this all theists are agreed, and it is the teaching of Holy Scripture, as well as of reason, Gen. 21:33; Deut. 32:40; Ps. 90:2; Isa. 41:4; 1 Tim. 1:17; 2 Pet. 3:8; Rev. 10:6. But many theists include the idea of *timelessness* in the eternity of God. This is suggested by such passages as John 3:13 and 8:58, which refer to the higher nature of Jesus Christ, and perhaps by that of James 1:17, which refers simply to God, or, possibly, to God the Father. It is also suggested by the difficulty of conceiving how temporal succession could be experienced by a self-existent being, or how temporal limitation could exist along with perfection of nature. Yet it is evident that the Scriptures usually speak of God as if his life were divisible into periods, past and future, like ours, and it is also clear that the faculties of the human mind are wholly unable to conceive of existence independent of time. If God is a perfect being, can he grow wiser by growing older, or can he grow older without growing wiser? It appears to be self-evident that a being living in time, or under law to time, must be finite, must find his knowledge changing if not increasing, and as far as human reason can judge

of the case, must be uncertain as to what will occur in the wide realm of moral action among men and angels.

4. As infinite, God is also *omnipresent.* This, too, is an unimaginable mode of existence, but not therefore incredible. There is no point in the universe where God is not. In many places the Scriptures represent God as *filling* immensity; in others, they represent him as being *present* everywhere, 1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chron. 6:18; Isa. 43:2; 66:1; Jer. 23:23; Amos 9:2; Ps. 139:6-12; Matt. 28:20; Acts 17:27, 28. Lotze says that, by omnipresence is meant the fact that "God is alike near to every point of the world by his immediate activity; that consequently, his will is neither compelled to traverse any way whatever in order to reach an element of the universe; nor does it need any intermediate agency to act on it." And Dr. Park defines omnipresence by saying that "God does or can develop his activity in all places at the same time."

No attempt has been made to trace the *progressive* revelation of God in the sacred writings, (1) because we are entitled and required to give the view which results from the teaching of the whole Bible, as the final testimony of Scripture concerning God; and (2) because biblical criticism has not yet laid securely the foundations for a history of the *progressive* revelation of God to the people of Israel. As long as there is reason for doubt concerning the date of the principal documents on which we rely for the early religion and history of Israel, so long will it be unsafe to state what views of God were taught at different times. Biblical theology, as a historical study, must wait for the conclusions of criticism.

But systematic theology is permitted and expected to pluck the ripe fruit of revelation, as well as of nature, giving less attention to the germination and growth of that fruit. Indeed, it would be perfectly legitimate for systematic theology to incorporate simply the teaching

of Christ and his Apostles, omitting the preparatory and less adequate teaching of the Old Testament. Yet the doctrine of God is presented with such beauty and power in many parts of the Old Testament, that we cannot fail to be helped by the presentation. His holiness in Isaiah, his justice in Amos, his mercy in Hosea, his righteousness and grace in the Pentateuch, and all his moral perfections in the Psalms appeal to every noble and holy impulse in the Christian's heart. Even in the earlier record God is a Shepherd and a Father to his people; and long before the birth of Christ there were predictions of his sending out his light and his truth to the ends of the earth.

III. That God has an Eternal Purpose

1. With the evidence before our minds that God is a self-existent and personal Being on whom all other beings and things depend, we may next consider HIS ACTION *ad extra, in the light of human reason and of divine revelation.* Not that the light of reason will make everything plain, so that we shall understand the ways of God as though he were altogether such an one as ourselves, but that it is the best light we have, and may be followed, if not boldly, at least cautiously. If, then, we discover order in the universe, it must be referred to him, and if order points to ends, proximate and ultimate, both the ends and the order presuppose a comprehensive purpose or plan in the mind of God.

2. Of this, as might be expected, the Scriptures afford evidence. See the first chapter of Ephesians; Isa. 14:24; 46:10, 11; Acts 15:18; 17:26; Rom. 8:28; 9:11; 2 Thess. 2:13; 2 Tim. 1:9; 1 Cor. 2:7; Matt. 25:34; Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; Prov. 16:4, 9.

From these and other passages it appears that the purpose of God antedates creation, springs from his own good pleasure, embraces all the events of time, and goes

into effect in every instance. Contemplated from the divine side such a purpose seems to be reasonable and necessary. It is almost inconceivable that a perfect Being should undertake the work of creation and moral government without it. But contemplated from the human side, it seems at first sight to be inconsistent with moral freedom and accountability. Whether it is so depends on the way in which the purpose is accomplished. It may be just as consistent with human freedom as is the foreknowledge of God.

The same reply must be made to the assertion that such a purpose on the part of God renders the use of means futile. For there is every reason to believe that this purpose is to be accomplished, in great measure, by the use of means, especially because God's plan, or purpose, must be supposed to include the intelligence, sensibility and will of man who is a free moral agent and coworker with God, whose choices must count for something in the divine administration.

3. In considering the purpose of God as logically antecedent to his action *ad extra,* it is natural to inquire after the *chief end* sought by him in that action.[1] The Scriptures suggest two distinguishable ends, for the attainment of which God undertook the work of creation and moral government, viz., (1) *the manifestation of his own glory* and (2) *the communication of good to his creatures.* His own glory must consist in the perfection, natural and moral, of his nature. To show what he is, is to manifest his glory, and to be appreciated and loved by moral beings, is to be glorified.

The following passages teach that the end for which

[1] See *Edwards* (J.), "A Dissertation concerning the End for which God created the World"; *Martin* (J.), "The Glory of God as the Great End of Moral Action," in "Theol. Tracts," III., pp. 221-242; *Baird* (S. J.), "God's object was to reveal himself," in "Elohim Revealed," p. 84 f.

God created the world was his own glory: Prov. 16:4; Rom. 11:36; Col. 1:16; Heb. 2:10; Isa. 48:11; 43:6, 7; 60:21; 61:3; Eph. 1:5; John 17:10; 2 Thess. 1:10-12; 1 Pet. 4:11; Rev. 14:6, 7; 1 Cor. 6:20; 10:31; 1:26-30; Eph. 2:8-10.

And those subjoined suggest that the end for which he made the world was the good of his creatures: Ps. 103:9; Ezek. 18:32; 33:11; Lam. 3:33; 2 Pet. 3:9; John 3:16; Eph. 2:4; 1 John 4:9, 10, 16; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:20; Deut. 7:7, 8; Ps. 25:8; 31:17; 44:26; 1 Cor. 3:22, 23; 2 Cor. 4:15; Ps. 136:4-9.

(3) It is thought that these two ends may be expressed as the manifestation of his own nature, or glory, by communicating good to beings who are endowed by him with capacities to receive good. And the fact that we become like him by being animated with love to others leads to a belief that his purpose to manifest his own glory is intrinsically the same as his purpose to create other beings and impart to them the greatest possible good. To wish them to honor love is to wish them to know and honor himself, and, by being like himself, to be most blessed.

(4) But two objections are raised to this view, one of them founded on the existence of suffering, and the other on the existence of sin, in the world.[1] a. Suffering is said to be in any and every form, an evil. But, even apart from sin, it exists among the creatures of God, and as an evil it cannot be embraced in a purpose which springs from love and fulfills itself by communicating good to finite beings.

In answer to this, it may be said, that suffering cannot

[1] *Ballantyne* (J.), "On the Origin of Evil"; *Bellamy* (Jos.), "The Wisdom of God in the Permission of Sin"; *Young* (J.), "Evil not of God"; *Barnes* (Alb.), "Sin and Suffering in the Universe"; *Ernesti* (H. F. T. L.), "Ursprung der Sünde"; *Müller* (J.), "The Christian Doctrine of Sin"; *Royce* (J.), "The Problem of Job," in "Studies of Good and Evil."

be included in the purpose of God, as an end to be sought for its own sake, but it may be included in that purpose as a means to greater happiness than could be otherwise attained. And it is not difficult to believe it such a means. For by no other agency could life be more surely guarded, or the highest development of life be more certainly insured. By no other agency could animals be more effectually moved to seek their food and to partake of it when needed. By no other agency could the sum total of animal life and of agreeable sensation be made greater than by this, the ministry of suffering.

b. There is sin in the world, and sin, in any and every form, is purely evil. It is moral evil, it is what ought not to be. Hence, it cannot be embraced in the purpose of One whose ultimate and highest aim is to impart good to finite beings.

This certainly is a great, if not an insuperable, objection to the view proposed. We have no desire to minimize it. Yet, if a universe which contains in it a race of beings able to do wrong as well as to do right is on the whole better, notwithstanding the presence of sin, than a universe without such a race of beings, even this objection is answered. The very goodness of God would move him to create beings who could and even would do wrong, rather than to exclude sin from the universe by limiting his creation to lower orders of beings.

What we seem to be required to teach is, that God purposed to originate a universe which would contain beings who could do wrong as well as right, and to use none but moral means in preventing them from doing wrong. His purpose included a permission of moral evil in this sense only, that he would not by natural or physical means exclude it from the universe, but not in the sense that he authorized any one to commit sin, or left any moral being in doubt concerning his hatred of sin.

Food for thought on this subject may be found in many

of the great writers of our own day. Dorner remarks, "Only this can be said that, after the race had sinned, God could not have willed to uphold it by its reproduction of itself with its sinful character, unless the upholding of our sinful race were a less evil than its destruction, and so a relative good" (II., p. 162). "It is conceivable," says Goldwin Smith, "that by being [becoming] ever so little better than himself the most abject of mankind may cast into the moral treasury a mite more precious in the estimation of the Creator of our moral being than the spotless virtue of a born seraph." And George Macdonald remarks that, "The will of the brooding Spirit must be a grand one, indeed, to enclose so much of what cannot be its will, and turn all to its purpose of eternal good! Our knowledge of humanity, how much more our knowledge of the Father of it, is moving as yet but in the first elements" (George MacDonald in "Sir Gibbie").

The doctrine of the divine purpose tends to fill the soul with adoring thoughts of God, and humble thoughts of self. Yet it is so apprehended by many as to make them feel that God is a hard master. "The existence of the smallest amount of pain and evil would seem to show that he is either not perfectly benevolent, or not all-powerful." But, as we have seen, this is a hasty judgment. The subject is therefore one to be studied with the utmost candor and reverence, and taught with the greatest care, in order that misapprehension may be prevented.

IV. That God has Created All Things through the Word

1. The first act of God in carrying into effect his purpose must have been an *act of creation,* that is to say, an act originating finite being and so increasing the sum total of real being. For this is what is meant by creating, in distinction from shaping, combining, organizing, or unfolding. And such action seems to be ascribed to God by the sacred writers: John 17:5, 24; Eph. 1:4; — Mark

13:19; Gen. 1:1; Rev. 10:6; — John 1:2; Heb. 11:3. It appears, therefore, that there was a time when the worlds were not yet founded, that they were founded or established by God through the Word, and that things visible were not made out of things that appear. The most obvious interpretation of John 1:2 is, that everything but God has been brought into being by divine energy in the person of the eternal Word. Not merely its form but its entire being is due to divine action. Yet it would be going too far to insist that this is the only possible interpretation.

2. But against this view of creation two objections have been urged:

(1) That it is unthinkable, and therefore cannot be true. This objection is not decisive, for many things are credible which are nevertheless unthinkable. This is true in mathematics, according to the highest authorities, and also in real life, unless we deny the freedom of the human will.

(2) That it supposes a limit to the being of God, and so pronounces him finite. On the contrary it declares his power and wisdom to be unlimited, and abridges no perfection of his nature. De Pressensé remarks that, "absolute liberty can certainly put limits on itself, can even assert itself by voluntarily accepting the limitations imposed by the created liberty of which it is itself the source."[1]

Self-limitation is an exercise of liberty, not an infringement of it, and can be easily distinguished from limitation originated by another. But creation does imply that God is not the sum total of being. It rejects pantheism.

3. The extent of creation is so great as to baffle imagination. The microscope and the telescope reveal equally wonderful ranges of being. Apparently there are no limits in either direction that can be reached by human

[1] "A Study of Origins," p. 101.

intelligence. And in the physical universe all parts seem to be bound together, so as to constitute a system. Science informs us that there is probably a genetic connection between atoms and worlds, and between the lowest forms of organized matter on earth and the highest, between the amœba and man, at least, as physical organisms.

4. But there are numerous intimations in the Word of God of extra-human and perhaps extra-organic beings, called angels,[1] who are not genetically related to one another, or indeed to any living creature; Matt. 22:30. They are spoken of as intelligent, moral beings, messengers of God, able to influence men, and created, probably, before the earth became habitable; Job. 38:7. They are bound to other parts of creation by spiritual rather than by natural ties, by reason rather than by gravitation.

V. That God Upholds All Things through the Word

1. All created things owe their continuance in being to the power of God. This proposition implies that all created things have a being or nature of their own, and that this being or nature is dependent on God. It is therefore opposed to a pantheistic, dualistic, or deistic view of God's relation to the world. For pantheism embraces the world in the idea of God, while dualism regards the world as uncreated and antagonistic to God, and deism pronounces the world, once created, perfect and self-sufficient. We believe the world to be in some sense real, but at the same time created and dependent.

2. Yet it is very difficult to explain what is meant by this dependence of the universe on God. The language of Scripture is general but positive: Job 10:12; Ps.

[1] See Appendix to Part Second, page 186.

104 : 29, 30; Isa. 40 : 26, 29; Neh. 9 : 6; Acts 17 : 28; Heb. 1 : 3; Col. 1 : 17. The sacred writers do not represent preservation as equivalent to a perpetual act of creation, but they distinguish it from simple oversight, care, or direction. God's power is a factor in everything that exists.

3. Prof. Harris (S.) remarks that, "force, independent of being, is unthinkable. Its existence necessarily carries our minds to a Being transcending matter, *i. e.*, to God. God is immanent in nature because it depends on God for its existence and for all its powers. No analogy of the action of finite beings on one another is adequate to explain the infinite in and through the finite. Sir Isaac Newton compares God's immanence in nature to the immanence of the spirit in the body, sustaining and directing energies; Edwards, to the action of light on a portrait, sustaining it in existence." Prof. Lotze says, "The proposition of religion is: Preservation is continual creation. It is not conceivable that this can be intended to mean: the world of the next instant is, as to its content, entirely new and foreign to that of the preceding instant. So far from this, we naturally accept the assumption that, in the divine activity, there is unity and coherence; and, for this reason, the creative act of the next instant also is a consequence of that of the preceding. But nevertheless, the aforesaid proposition would deny that the world of one instant *perpetuates itself* by its own agency and by its general laws into the next instant." [1]

In the illustration by Edwards, the picture has no color or reality as a picture without the light, but it has that which is real and necessary to its existence as a picture with the light. The pigment and the light are related to each other, and both are necessary to the existence of the visible portrait. In regard to Lotze's statement, we can only say that, so far as history and observation can be trusted, religion does not affirm that, "Preservation is continual creation." Neither Jesus Christ

[1] "Phil. of Religion," p. 93.

nor any one of his Apostles is known to have enunciated such a proposition. Certainly religion affirms nothing of the kind. It is a purely speculative opinion.

4. But the doctrine that all created beings are forever dependent on God for existence, having no absolute life of their own, not only agrees with a certain feeling of dependence which is instinctive in man, but also tends to unite the Christian's heart to God by a sense of unspeakable gratitude. He would not have it otherwise. He delights in the thought that underneath him are the everlasting arms.

5. If it be objected, that the view here given makes God the upholder of moral evil, since he upholds the evil-doer at the very instant and in the very act of evil-doing, it may be replied, (1) that God upholds what he has created, namely, the free moral agent; but he neither upholds, nor has he created, evil-doing. His energy in respect to the creation and conservation of moral beings is *efficient*, but his energy in respect to their wrong doing is merely *quiescent*. He forbids, but does not dynamically prevent. (2) That the nature of moral government appears to justify, if not to require, the very course which God pursues; for to give a sinner time to repent is to give him time which he may use in further sin. And (3) that God forbids wrong-doing, and brings a vast amount of moral influence to bear against it.

VI. That God Provides for the Fulfillment of his Eternal Purpose [1]

1. The word "providence" signifies primarily, *foresight;* but the idea of forethought and provision for the

[1] See *Johnson* (E. H.), "An Outline of Systematic Theology," p. 101 f.; *Clarke* (W. N.), "Outline of Christian Theology," p. 133 f.; *Strong* (A. H.), "Systematic Theology," p. 207 f.; *Smith* (H. B.), "System of Christian Theology," p. 106 f.; *Flavel* (J.),

future is closely connected with that of foresight; so closely, indeed, that, in theological language, the term providence means, "divine supervision, the care and guardianship of God over his creatures."[1]

Providence presupposes a plan for reaching an end, and is the method of action by which that end is reached. "I believe," says Francis Bacon, "that God . . . doth accomplish and fulfill his divine will in all things, great and small, singular and general, as fully and exactly by providence as he could by miracle."

2. According to Paul, God's providence has respect to all mankind, for "he made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having fixed appointed periods, and the bounds of their habitations that they should seek God, if perhaps they might feel after him and find him, although he is not far from each one of us," Acts 17:26, 27. According to the writer of the Eightieth Psalm, it has special reference to his chosen people, for God is addressed as the Shepherd of Israel — compare Deut. 32:8-14 — and, according to the writer of the Twenty-third Psalm, it is equally concerned with the welfare of every saint, for he sings, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want." An Oriental shepherd was the leader, the guardian, and the feeder of his flock. Compare with this Old Testament language the words of Jesus, Matt. 11:28-30; and John 10:11, 14, 15. Yea, more, God's personal care provides for every beast of

"Divine Conduct; or, the Mystery of Providence"; *Davidson* (A. D.), "Lectures, Expository and Practical, on the Book of Esther"; *Sherlock* (W.), "A Discourse concerning the Divine Providence"; *Charnock* (S.), "The Providence of God," *South* (R.), I. VII., "All Contingencies under God's Providence"; *Bushnell* (H.), "Every Man's Life a Plan of God," in "Sermons of the New Life"; *Zwingli* (U.), "De Providentia Dei"; *Bushnell* (H.), "Moral Uses of Dark Things"; and the principal works on Systematic Theology.

[1] Century Dictionary.

the earth and bird of the air and flower of the field, Matt. 6:26-30.

3. Indeed, it is self-evident that, whatever is worth creating is worthy of oversight and control, whether it be valuable for what it is in itself, or for its relation to something else of intrinsic worth. And so the Psalmist calls upon the sun and moon and stars, upon fire and hail, snow and vapor, upon stormy winds and mountains, fruitful trees and all cedars, to praise the name of the Lord: 148:3-9. Says Prof. George I. Chace, "According to the most advanced teachings of science, the primary constituents of matter are not mere atoms, as heretofore supposed, whose existence demands no explanation, but elaborately organized structures, miniature systems of worlds, as much to be accounted for as the larger systems built from them."[1] If this be so, what limit can be put to the providence of God? If infinitesimal worlds are related to colossal worlds and systems of worlds, and if God is the Author of them all, we are constrained to believe that his foresight and goodness are perpetually concerned with the ongoing of every part, however minute, as well as with the ongoing of the infinitely complex and magnificent whole, and to cry out with the inspired poet, "All thy works praise thee": Ps. 145:10.

4. The providence of God embraces many particulars, some of which relate especially to the spiritual welfare of men, for example: (1) God's direct action on the hearts of men, Matt. 18:20; John 20:21; Rom. 5:5; Gal. 5:22; Phil. 2:13; 4:13. (2) His coöperation with them in prayer, Rom. 8:26. (3) His action adapted to the moral state of the one affected by it, Gen. 18:20, 21; Josh. 3:15, 16; John 3:10; Heb. 2:4. (4) His power overruling the wickedness of men, Gen. 50:20; Ex. 3:19-21; Ps. 76:11. (5) Employing angels and demons, Ps. 103:20; Matt. 18:10; Acts 5:19;

[1] "A Memorial of," p. 112.

Heb. 1:14; 2 Sam. 24:1. (6) And utilizing irrational creatures and the elements of nature, Ex. 8:12, 13, 16, 19; Josh. 10:11; Joel 1:4-12.

In providence God sometimes reveals the principles of his moral government by rules adapted in form to the present condition of those addressed. Thus the laws of the Mosaic economy in respect to domestic servitude, divorce for any cause but one, revenge for injury to kindred, and distinction of clean animals from unclean, were adapted to the condition of the people as a theocracy, but are not suited to men of all nations and times.

Again, so close a connection unites all parts and events of the created universe that God's government must be providential over every part and event, or over nothing at all. Hence the propriety of distinguishing between a general and a special providence is doubtful. It would be a gain in point of accuracy, if we were to characterize the providence of God as special in the case of miracles, as gracious in respect to Christians, and as particular in all things.

In a letter to Prof. Gray, Charles Darwin asks: "Do you believe that when a swallow snaps up a gnat that God designed that that particular swallow should snap up that particular gnat at that particular instant?" Why not? In his later years Darwin confesses, "My mind seems to have become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts, but why this should have caused the atrophy of that part of the brain alone on which the higher tastes depend, I cannot conceive. The loss of these tastes is a loss of happiness, and may possibly be injurious to the intellect, and more probably to the moral character, by enfeebling the emotional part of our nature." Jesus Christ taught that even the hairs of our heads are numbered by the heavenly Father, and that he cares for the sparrow, the lily, and, by parity of reason, for everything he has made.

5. No other doctrine of the divine government satis-

fies the Christian heart as does the scriptural one, that it is throughout providential; and it is strikingly suggested by the words of a pagan writer, "If God will, you are safe, though you swim on a straw"; unless, indeed, these words overlook the natural means which God so constantly employs in providing for the weal of his creatures. Philosophical thought is tending also at the present time to recognize the intimate relation of God to all existence and action, to all beings and events.

PART SECOND

MANKIND, THEIR NATURE, CHARACTER AND CONDITION

PART SECOND

MANKIND,[1] THEIR NATURE, CHARACTER AND CONDITION

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF MANKIND

THE second division of Christian theology treats of mankind, who are by nature bipartite, racial, reproductive, social, and moral; in character sinful; and in condition lost, yet recoverable.

I. Men are by Nature Bipartite

In other words, their nature is a synthesis of the only two forms of being known to us, the spiritual and the material, a microcosm of the universe, being on the one side an image of God, and on the other an image of inanimate nature. For proof, consider:

[1] *Hopkins* (M.), "An Outline Study of Man," 1876; "The Scriptural Idea of Man," 1883; *Anderson* (J.), "What is Man? His Origin, Life, History, and Future Destiny as Revealed in the Word of God"; *Lee* (J. W.), "The Making of a Man"—"physical, social, intellectual, moral, æsthetic, spiritual"; *Heard* (J. B.), "The Tripartite Nature of Man—Spirit, Soul, Body, applied to illustrate the Doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body"; *Laidlaw* (J.), "The Bible Doctrine of Man"; *Delitzsch* (F.), "A System of Biblical Psychology"; *Davis* (N. K.), "Elements of Psychology"; *Hill* (D. J.), "Elements of Psychology"; *Quatrefages* (J. L. A.), "The Human Species"; *Darwin* (C.), "The Descent of Man"; *Drummond* (H.), "The Ascent of Man"; *Haeckel* (E.), "The Evolution of Man."

1. *The prevalent representation of the Scriptures.* For although we cannot assume that the sacred writers give a scientific account of men as living beings, we are entitled to believe that they were qualified to speak of human nature, in so far as it is related to the moral and religious condition of mankind, here and hereafter. The following passages are considered to be fairly representative of New Testament language on the subject before us: Matt. 10:28; 26:41, cf. Mark 14:38; Luke 12:22 f.; Acts 2:27; Rom. 2:28, 29; 1 Cor. 5:3, 5; 6:16 f.; 7:34; 2 Cor. 7:1; Col. 2:5; Heb. 12:9; James 2:26; 1 Pet. 2:11; 3:18; 4:19. And these with similar statements make it certain that the words "soul" and "spirit" are often used interchangeably, to connote the spiritual side of man's nature in distinction from the bodily side, and lead to the conclusion that human nature consists of but two parts, body and soul, or flesh and spirit.

2. *The phenomena of consciousness.* There is nothing, it is believed, in human experience which may not be traced as readily to two essential principles as to three. It is as easy to believe that the spirit has direct connection with the body as to suppose that it has connection with it indirectly, through an intermediate substance or power; to suppose that one and the same spiritual entity has a wide range of susceptibilities, passions, and powers, some higher and some lower, as to suppose two spiritual entities have this range.

"Instead of looking in man for an animal soul, into which, as a wild stock of inferior nature, a distinctively higher shoot has been grafted, we ought rather from the first to see in the living human mind a peculiar being, whose characteristic nature is at work even in the simplest and lowest manifestations of its activity, though its full significance and the interval by which it is separated from the animal soul appear most distinctly in the final results of its development."[1]

[1] *Lotze* (H.), "Microcosmus," I., pp. 532, 535, 536.

3. But there are a few expressions of Scripture which have been thought to teach the *tripartite* nature of man: *viz.*, 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 4:12; Phil. 1:27; Lu. 1:47; 1 Cor. 15:44.

Only three of them, however, deserve serious examination, namely, the first two and the last. The first is the clearest, and Ellicott, an admirable expositor, pronounces it "a distinct enunciation of three component parts of the nature of man." This is unquestionably the most obvious view of the Apostle's meaning, but we cannot think it is correct. DeWette understands the language to be "rhetorical," used for the sake of impression, of emphasis, and not for instruction as to the constituents of man's nature. Compare Matt. 22:37; Mark 12:30. It is a case of repetition, of using two words in place of one, in order to hold the mind a little longer on the nobler side of man's nature.

The second should be translated, "piercing even to a dividing of soul and of spirit, of joints and of marrow"; not dividing between soul and spirit, between joints and marrow, but a sword which pierces and divides the soul itself and the spirit itself; and as the marrow is conceived of as more secret and inaccessible than the joints, so is the spirit conceived of, probably, as more secret and inaccessible than the soul. Tholuck defines "soul," in this place, as "the spirit according to its *natural* side," and "spirit" as the "spirit according to its *eternal* side."

The last passage reads, "it is sown a psychical body, it is raised a pneumatical body." But a psychical body here means a body adapted to the spirit in its present condition and life, while a pneumatical body means a body adapted to the spirit in its eternal condition and life. For as we cannot suppose Paul to say that our present bodies are made of psychical substance, that is, of the same substance as our souls, so we cannot suppose him to say that our future bodies will be made of spiritual

substance, that is, of the same kind of substance as our spirits. He describes the two kinds of bodies in view of their functions, not of their essence.

If, however, the nature of man be tripartite, we may consider the third principle mere life, like that of animals, since the word ψυχή is several times used in that sense. But so understood, it would perish with the body, rather than be, as some have conjectured, a rational substance which environs the spirit and survives the dissolution of the body.

4. Yet the words *soul* and *spirit* are not strictly synonymous in Scripture. If they do not connote two distinct parts of human nature, as trichotomists believe, they denote the same part as seen in different lights, or as performing different functions, for in certain connections one of them is almost always used, and in other connections the other. What then are the biblical uses of the two words? By a thorough study of all the passages in which they occur, Prof. D. R. Goodwin finds (1) "That spirit and soul are used indiscriminately for the whole inner man." (2) "That the same predicates, the same affections, are ascribed to both." (3) "That 'soul and body' or 'spirit and body' stand alike for the whole man." (4) "That 'spirit' and 'flesh' have sometimes a special contrast, but not as being constituent parts of our natural constitution." (5) "That 'heart' is used interchangeably with 'spirit' or with 'soul.'" (6) "That 'spirit' and 'mind' are contrasted as well as conjoined." (7) "That sin, pollution, perversion, as well as righteousness and purity, are predicated alike of soul, spirit, heart, and mind." (8) "That life after death, future punishment and salvation, are predicated alike of the soul and of the spirit." (9) "That soul and spirit are both used for the principle of life, the animating principle in the body." (10) "That both terms are used for the life of beasts, and also in

respect to God in the New Testament as well as in the Old." (11) "That both are used to denote the seat of the affections, but also the rational conscious mind and the proper personal self." On the other hand, the special uses of spirit are: "*a.* To indicate the Spirit of God — the Holy Spirit. *b.* To indicate His miraculous gifts, as in the Acts frequently, and sometimes elsewhere; for instance, in 1 Cor. 14: 12. *c.* To denote devils or demons, 'evil' or 'foul' spirits, and also good angels, 'ministering spirits.' *d.* To denote temper, disposition, character: as 'ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of'; Luke 9: 55,[1] 'a meek and quiet spirit;'" 1 Pet. 3: 4.[2]

Hatch says that, "(1) Καρδία, πνεῦμα, and ψυχή are capable of being interchanged as translations of the same Hebrew words. (2) That consequently the lines of distinction between them, whatever they may be, are not sharply drawn. (3) That a survey of the predicates which are attached to each of them shows a similar impossibility of limiting them to special groups of mental phenomena, with the exceptions that (*a*) καρδία is most commonly used of will and intention, (*b*) χή,ψυ of appetite and desire."

5. *The mutual relations of the two parts of man's nature are most intimate and, as far as this life is concerned, inseparable.* The action of each depends upon the other. All thinking, feeling, and willing are attended by movements of the brain. And, on the other hand, movements of the brain appear to influence the actions of the mind. The correlation, the interdependence, the interaction, are certain and wonderful. But leadership may safely be assigned to the soul.

"The body as an organ of the soul is the result of the informing, creating activity of the soul itself. The soul is immanent in the body, not by virtue of the body as mere body, but because, being transcendent, it has expressed and mani-

[1] But the text is uncertain.

[2] *Hatch* (E.), "Essays in Biblical Greek," III., p. 94 f.

fested its nature in the body... It is a living and active force which has formed, and is constantly forming, the body, as its own mechanism."[1]

The language of Prof. Dewey merits close attention. Whether the soul be strictly organific or not, its condition has oftentimes surprising influence over the body. "A merry heart is a good medicine; but a broken spirit dries up the bones": Prov. 17:22. Many a man dies because he thinks himself dying. Many a man lives because he feels that he must and will live. Trust in God, trust in a physician, trust in a medicine, trust in a philosophy, trust in a relic, trust, confidence, assurance, whether based on real or imaginary grounds, is a wonderful restorative of health. It is sheer skepticism to deny that in millions of instances bodily life or death depends on the soul's condition. Hope is life, despair death. This truth, not the truth of its ontology, has given to "Christian science" its power to win adherents. But, on the other hand, the body is not an illusion. It will not live forever without food. To pray for daily bread is a Christian duty, so long as one lives in an animal body. If Christian scientists were to follow their doctrine consistently and treat the body as non-real, not one of them would be alive on earth at the end of a single year.

II. Men Are by Nature Racial

By this we mean that all varieties of mankind belong to one race or species.[2] This we infer:

1. *From the language of Holy Scripture*: Gen. 1:27; 2:7, 15 f.; 6:7, 8; 7:21; 8:1, f.; Acts 17:26; Rom.

[1] Prof. *Dewey* in Bib. Sac. for 1886, p. 260.

[2] *Müller* (M.), "Lectures on the Science of Language," Series I. and II.; *Burnouf* (E.), "The Science of Religions," "Revue des Deux Mondes," 1867, 1868; *Darwin* (C.), "Origin of Species" and "Descent of Man"; *Drummond* (H.), "The Ascent of Man."

5: 12, f.; 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22. This language appears to be sufficiently plain, and we are aware of no good reason for doubting that the writers believed in the unity of mankind. The word "blood" (*αἵματος*), in Acts 17: 26, is probably an addition to the original text, but its absence does not weaken the testimony of Paul to the derivation of all men from Adam. The words of the Apostle in his Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians put his belief beyond question. Moreover, the theological bearing of the context in both these instances forbids us to doubt the import of his teaching.

Yet Prof. Winchell, in his "Preadamites," insists that there are evident proofs in the early chapters of Genesis of men before Adam and Eve. These proofs he finds, (1) In Cain's fear of being killed, if cast out as a fugitive and wanderer, Gen. 4: 13, 14. But as Cain was probably more than a hundred years old (see Gen. 5: 3), he may have had occasion to fear the vengeance of his brothers who were shocked at his horrible crime. (2) In Cain's marriage, which would have been incest if he had taken for his wife a younger sister. But Prof. Winchell's theory of Preadamites only carries the difficulty back to an earlier date. It does not remove it, except by supposing that more than one pair was created at the same time and in the same region — of which there is no evidence. (3) In Cain's building a city, a work too great for one man with only a wife and child to assist him, Gen. 4: 17. But we are not informed how long it was before Cain built his city or how large an affair it was. (4) In the expression, "Sons of God," in Gen. 6: 2, which is best explained by taking it to mean men of unknown ancestry who took for wives daughters of Adam, or "of the Adam," as Prof. Winchell translates הָאָדָם. To us it seems more natural to suppose that "the sons of God" were religious men of the line of Seth, and "the daughters of men," ungodly women of the family of Cain. The art and wealth of the world appear to have belonged at that time to the descendants of Cain. (5) In the genealogical table of Genesis, chapters 10 and 11, which

is limited to the peoples known to the writer, and was not intended to embrace all branches of the human race. This may be admitted, without finding in it any evidence of Pre-adamite tribes or families. We do not see that the Scriptures afford satisfactory proof, or distinct suggestion, of men living before Adam and Eve.

2. *The* RACIAL UNITY *of mankind may also be inferred from their natural similarity the world over.* Their anatomical structure is nearly the same everywhere. The difference between the highest and the lowest types of men are said by competent critics to be less than the differences betwen varieties of the same species in some of the lower animals. Their physiological characteristics lead to the same view. All races of men are fruitful with one another; the duration of pregnancy is the same in all; the mean frequency of the pulse, and the normal temperature of the body are the same. Their pathological liabilities are the same in all nations. In like circumstances they are liable to like diseases. But none of the lower animals are subject to all these and to no others. There is also a difference between the blood cells of men and those of brutes. The mental powers of men are everywhere the same in kind, the world over. This is an argument of superlative force. And at present, the tendency of scientific speculation is decidedly favorable to the oneness of the human race, but not, perhaps, in favor of the date of its appearance on earth, which is suggested to a majority of readers by the words of Genesis.

3. The formation of the human body from the dust of the ground by a process of evolution, extending through millions of years, is asserted by biologists to rest on good probable evidence; but few of them claim the same degree of evidence for the soul's derivation from animal instinct. The conscious self is a mystery to science; so also is life. Obviously, the language of

Genesis is reconcilable with the scientific hypothesis of a slow and evolutionary formation of the human body. Nor, unless chronology forbids, is there any biblical ground for denying the differentiation of mankind into several families by evolution.

III. As Racial, Men Are Reproductive

This is implied in the term employed to describe them. Men are homogeneous. A genetic relation binds together our first parents and all their descendants. And so there is a fact or law of heredity to be reckoned with in the study of theology. Immense benefits come to men as social, moral, and religious beings from their kinship as members of a race, but evils, also, which must be considered in the sequel. No doubt is entertained concerning the transmission of physical life from parents to children. Procreation of the bodily organism is conceded; but is the same true of human souls or spirits? Whence have they been derived since the creation of Adam? Three answers have been given to this question, by *pre-creation,* by *co-creation,* by *procreation.* Each of these answers may be criticised briefly, and the best of them accepted, till we find a better.

1. *Pre-creation,* or *the pre-temporal creation* of human souls has been asserted as a reasonable and probable hypothesis by a few great Christian teachers. *Origen* believed that the disparity of condition between men at the beginning of their earthly life must be due to a difference of moral conduct in a previous existence. All souls were created pure and equal. But many fell into sin, who were not, however, wholly lost to goodness. These were sent to the earth and united with material bodies, each in a condition answering to his former sins. Emanuel Kant, in the interest of moral accountability on the part of men, believed in a *timeless* existence of the

soul, which as a *noumenon* is free, while as a *phenomenon,* it is not. The fall occurred in that mysterious existence which he calls timeless. Julius Müller, in his able work on "The Christian Doctrine of Sin," adopts the same view. The inclination of men to sin in the present life is due to a free *timeless* act of transgression. Edward Beecher, in his "Conflict of the Ages," maintains the preëxistence of human souls as the only key to a reasonable theodicy.

But against this hypothesis may be urged the following considerations: —

(1) We have no consciousness of having either lived or sinned in a previous state. Memory is silent in respect to all this. (2) A timeless existence of souls is wholly inconsistent with finite life. (3) The Scriptures suggest an entirely different reason for our bias to evil, namely, our vital connection with Adam and Eve.

2. *Co-creation,* or *the creation of human souls along with the generation of their bodies.* This is described by Lotze, as follows: "At the place where, and at the moment when, the germ of the organic being is formed in the coherent system of the physical course of nature, this fact furnishes the incitement or moving reason which induces the all-comprehending One Being . . . to beget from himself besides, as a consistent supplement to such fact, the soul belonging to this organism.[1] Instead of the words "to beget from himself," which agree with Lotze's monism, others would insert the words "to create."

This hypothesis is defended as both scriptural and rational. The statements of Scripture most confidently alleged are these: Num. 16:22; 27:16; Eccl. 12:7; Isa. 57:16; Zech. 12:1; Heb. 12:9. The last passage is adduced by many with an assurance that it is incapable

[1] "Outlines of Psychology," p. 117.

of any other just explanation. The others might certainly be accounted for by God's special and direct agency in imparting to Adam his spiritual nature, and perhaps by his mediate agency in pro-creation — the soul being mentioned in every case because it is that part of human nature which bears the divine likeness. The passage in Hebrews is not so easily expounded on any other hypothesis than that of co-creation. It is, however, noticeable that the passage does not say "our spirits," but "the spirits," and Bleek, one of the ablest interpreters of Hebrews, says that it is most probable the writer meant "the Father of all spiritual beings, who is also at the same time the only Father of believers and they his sons, in so far as his spirit is in them, and they have something more than a natural life (cf. Rom. 8: 14 ff.; Gal. 4: 6 f.; Heb. 2: 10 ff.)."

The hypothesis is also defended as accounting for the *individuality* of every new-born soul. It does so, without doubt, and this argument is not to be overlooked. But on the other hand it does not agree so well as the third hypothesis with the transmission of ethnical, national, tribal, and even parental traits of mind and temper.[1]

3. *Pro-creation,* or *generation* of human souls. This hypothesis is maintained by such arguments as these. (1) The supposed process of reproduction in the case of lower animals. For in them the immaterial principle of life, endued with instinct and some degree of intelligence, comes from the parents, and analogy justifies the assumption of a similar process in the case of men. (2) The ordinary phraseology of Scripture favors this hypothesis, for children as such, and not as organisms of flesh and blood, are commonly represented as born of their parents. Exceptions to this manner of speaking —

[1] *Hodge* (C.), "Systematic Theology," II., pp. 70-76.

as Heb. 12:9, and John 3:6 — may be easily explained, and are in fact very rare. (3) The close connection which is affirmed to exist between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity: Rom. 5:12 f. and 1 Cor. 15:22, is accounted for by this hypothesis. (4) The completeness of Christ's human nature is explained by it. We incline to the third hypothesis.[1]

4. The question as to the *duration* of human life can be answered only provisionally at this point. If the distinction, which has been made between the body and soul is correct, we are not warranted in affirming that natural death terminates the conscious existence of man. Closely connected as the two parts of human nature certainly are, the destiny of the nobler part is not bound indissolubly to that of the inferior part. We are authorized by the Scriptures to believe that it is possible to kill the body without destroying the soul, and are instructed that both good and bad men are conscious after death, Matt. 10:28; Luke 16:19 f. More than this they teach the endless existence of men, and at least imply the natural immortality of their souls, Matt. 25:46; Cor. 15:44, 46, 49, 53, 54.

But, apart from the Scriptures, the mental, the moral and the spiritual powers of mankind point to their future and eternal existence.

Hermann Lotze says, "I doubt whether a view which regards the individual as *a merely passing phase* in the activity of an Infinite Substance, could have any logical reason for attributing to such a nonentity any obligation to maintain a dignity belonging to it in its individual and transitory character — a dignity which it should or could maintain by its

[1] *Shedd* (W. G. T.), "Dogmatic Theology," II., ch. I.; *Strong* (A. H.), "Systematic Theology," p. 252, 253; *Gerhart* (E. V.), "Institutes of the Christian Religion," II., p. 116 f.; *Biedermann* (A. E.), Dogmatik, p. 192 f.; *Heppe* (H.), Dogmatik, Sec. XI., p. 138 f.

own spontaneous activity — whether such dignity ought not much rather to have its presence or absence laid to the account of the Infinite Substance itself." [1]

Moral obligation presupposes a future life. And John Fiske writes,

"We may be sure that the creature whose intelligence measures pulsations of molecules and unravels the secret of the whirling nebula is no creature of a day, but the child of the universe, the heir of all the ages, in whose making and perfecting is to be found the consummation of God's creative work." [2]

IV. Men are by Nature Social

They were intended to be companions in life. This might rationally be inferred from their racial origin and connection. But there is other evidence yet more convincing. By instinct, by affection, by necessary interdependence men are social. Solitary life is exceptional, partial, and, on a large scale, impossible. Infancy must have the mother's care. Childhood can neither protect nor develop itself without parental help or its equivalent. And no considerable progress in mental or moral life is possible without the coöperation of many. Social life is normal, indispensable, and of transcendent importance to the welfare of mankind.

The fervid language of Saisset scarcely exaggerates this thought.

"I find in my heart a whole treasury of sympathetic yearnings. I have need of men as men have need of me. In them as in me the object of love is first existence and life in their harmonious beauty, but especially the human person. I cannot remain imprisoned in my solitary self. I must enter into the souls of others, live in them, draw them towards me, and feel them live in my life. A sweet and irresistible sympathy

[1] Microcosmus, I., p. 100.

[2] See Ps. 139: 14-16.

makes me feel what they feel, makes me sad with their sadness, happy in their happiness, doubly joyful when they are associated with my joy, almost insensible to sorrow when I feel it is shared, wanting to extend to them all the good that I have, to give them my strength, my thought, my whole soul; feeling myself richer, freer, stronger, and completer, the more I strip myself and impoverish myself for them."[1]

But there is less need at the present time than ever before of insisting on the social nature of mankind. It will be enough to bear this fact in mind continually as we study the following topics.

V. Men are by Nature Moral Beings, Subject to the Law of God

To this fact reference was made in studying Nature's revelation of God. But it must now be examined afresh. Men are moral beings because they can see that they *ought* to do this and *ought not* to do that. This perception of duty presupposes an authoritative rule of action, a knowledge more or less complete of that rule, and a sense of power to obey it. In other words, we have to examine at this point: *The moral law; its source and its content.*

1. *Its source.* The moral law has been spoken of as being *without source* or *author,* eternal and unchangeable by its very nature. It would bind us to duty, if there were no God. And it is the only standard with which we can compare the character of God. We must know what righteousness is in order to pronounce him righteous.

(1) This is not so, for the existence of moral law depends on the existence of moral beings, especially of God. We can form no idea of it apart from the reason of such beings. If one could suppose God and all moral beings non-existent, he would have to suppose moral law

[1] "Modern Pantheism," II., p. 168.

non-existent also. The source of moral law is the nature of God. "To suppose moral order self-existent and supreme, is to give it the place of God, and make it higher than the Highest. To suppose it coexistent with God and independent of him, is to divide the sovereignty of the universe between abstract law and the Being consenting to it." [1]

(2) The moral law may be spoken of, in the *second* place, as being eternal and unchangeable *in the mind of God,* who is at once the First Cause and the Supreme Reason. And this view of it is both natural and philosophical. For law supposes a lawgiver, order supposes a mind which has established it. Moreover, this view of it is truly theistic and simple. It denies self-existence to everything but God. It gives him the full honors of Creatorship. It permits us to worship him as sole and supreme. And it satisfies our mental desire for unity. "If, as we rightly believe, our mind is in possession of innate, necessary truth, we certainly commit the first and greatest sin against the nature of that truth when we ascribe to it any origin which implies that even its content is not due solely to that Creative Power."[2]

2. *Its content.* What does the law which expresses the eternal reason of God demand of men as their duty?

(1) According to the Scriptures, man was created in the image of God, and is under obligation to realize the purpose of his creation by being morally like his Maker: Gen. 1:26, 27; Lev. 11:45; Matt. 5:48; 1 Pet. 1:14-16; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10. When God's moral nature is appealed to as a reason for holiness, no other reason is brought to view. After the highest, any other would be weak. a. God is love, and man is required to love him supremely: Deut. 10:12; Matt. 22:37; 1 John 4:19. The duty thus enjoined is not that of honoring moral law or

[1] *Secretan.*

[2] *Lotze,* "Microcosmus," I., p. 389.

order, but that of loving God who is a person and an impersonation of love; not that of reverence to moral right in the abstract, or even to righteousness as an attribute, but devotion of soul to the Person in whom holy love lives and reigns. b. In order to be like God, man is required to love his fellow-man as he loves himself: Matt. 22:39; Acts 17:26. This rule assumes that love or benevolence ought to be proportioned to the worth of the being loved; that a certain degree of self-love is natural and right; that men possess at least that degree of self-love, and that this is a proper measure of the love which they ought to have for their peers in the sight of God.

It will be observed that the demand of God's law is perfect holiness or perfect love. Are these then identical, or must some distinction between them be recognized? Whatever is moral in the character of God is embraced in his holiness, whether it be inclination to good or aversion from evil, whether it be love of right or hatred of wrong. But is the word "love" equally comprehensive and equally moral in its significance? In answer to these questions, it may be said, — (a) that the Scriptures do not use the words as synonyms: Ex. 20:5, 6; Ps. 89:14, 15; Deut. 7:9, 10. See also the following passages in the New Testament: John 3:16, 36; Rom. 2:4-6; 2 Thess. 1:7-9; Rev. 6:15-17; (b) that the common language of men distinguishes between the words. Everywhere men speak of rectitude, uprightness, justness, as a quality of character distinguishable from kindness, goodness, benevolence, love; (c) that our moral judgment refuses to identify holiness and love. For the law of right, as thus revealed to conscience, though it recognizes the duty of love, affirms the duty of being just in preference to being generous, when it is impossible to be both just and generous.

The maxim, *suum cuique,* has a moral basis independ-

ent of love; it is seen by the reason itself to be right. Nay, the command, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," assumes equality of nature in those to whom it is addressed; and between beings of the same grade that which is produced or earned belongs, in the first place, to him who produces or earns it. Another cannot rightfully take it from him without his consent, or withhold it from him beyond the time fixed for its return. Only that Being to whom he himself belongs, by right of creation and preservation, can justly claim the product of his labor, with a claim superior to his own.

(d) Accordingly the demand for holiness, or moral likeness to God, is broader than the demand for love, though the latter is practically equivalent to the former, since perfect love would always lead to holiness. The point at which human nature is morally weak is that of love to God and man. Were love perfect, conscience would be enthroned. It is lack of love, it is selfishness, which blinds the eye of our moral judgment, and moves us to disobey the will of God.

(2) We may seek to discover the *content* of the moral law by another method. If we can ascertain the ends for which God made the worlds, we may be able to learn from them the law of moral action by which we ought to be coworkers with him in seeking those ends. Those ends may be called the *summum bonum,* or greatest possible good. What, then, is the greatest possible good in the eyes of a perfect Being? Is it character or happiness, or both these united?

a. It may be the production of righteous moral beings. Yet if this be the case, the whole material universe, together with the life of all beings that have no moral nature, must be looked upon as simply means to an end, or helps to the formation of holy character in men and angels. b. It may be the greatest possible happiness of the universe. Yet, if this be true, righteousness is

only a means to an end, only a way to the highest good, but not a good in itself. Or, c. it may be that both righteousness and happiness are good in themselves, and therefore worthy ends for the action of God, that the *summum bonum* is the greatest possible holiness combined with the greatest possible happiness. d. We are disposed to accept the last view as preferable to either the first or the second, but to regard happiness, in the case of moral beings, as subordinate to holiness, perhaps as God's encouragement to holiness.

(a) But against this conclusion, it is sometimes said, that Christ himself reduces the whole divine law to the one requirement of love, and therefore love must be the sum total of righteousness. The inference is not a necessary one. For what Christ did was to point out the central principle of the law of God as taught by Moses and the prophets; and the more any man studies that law, the more clearly will he perceive that it was given for a practical purpose, requiring just what was wanting in man. For the only obstacle to perfect virtue in men is a want of supreme love to God and proper love to one's neighbor. *If love conditions and insures all right action,* it is certainly the one thing which needs to be required by a law whose aim is thoroughly practical; for it is the one thing liable to be withheld, leaving conscience weak because alone.

(b) Moreover, it is not easy to see how God can be actuated by good will to upright moral beings, *because they are upright,* without being displeased with sinful beings, *because they are sinful.* If righteousness is an end prized by him, unrighteousness must be opposed by him as evil. But righteousness and unrighteousness, holiness and sin, exist only in moral beings; they are not entities, but qualities of the action and disposition of persons. Hence, they are evil only as the moral beings whom they represent are evil. And so, in the last

analysis, it is *holy beings* who are looked upon by God with complacency, and sought as an end worthy of all that is done by him in creation, and providence, and redemption.

With creatures less highly endowed he may be pleased, because of the happiness which fills their life and which is the highest good of which they are capable, and also because of the purpose they serve in the education of mankind.

If, then, on grounds of reason, we assume that the ends sought by the Supreme Ruler in creation and providence are, *first,* holy and happy beings, since they are the best possible revelation of his own holiness and benevolence, and, *secondly,* other beings capable of enjoyment, we must conclude that men as moral beings, whose ideal character is one of likeness to himself, are bound to become, in the *first* place, morally like their Maker in purpose and action; and, in the *second* place, to do all in their power to bring other moral beings to the same mind and action; and, in the *third* place, to respect and serve with true kindness the welfare and comfort of all sentient creatures.

Such is the law under which men are placed as moral beings, and there is reason to believe that it has been made known to them as fully and as rapidly as they have been willing to receive it. We are now to examine more closely the moral constitution of men as related to this divine law.

3. *What are the faculties concerned in moral action?* If we divide the faculties of the human soul into those of knowing and feeling, desiring and willing, all these are concerned in moral action, and perhaps in every moral action. For to consider any one a moral being who is, strictly speaking, unable to perceive any difference between what ought to be done and what ought not to be done, is plainly irrational. A man cannot be under obli-

gation to do what he is utterly unable to know that he ought to do. Equally certain is it, that every moral action involves a feeling which is called moral, and that a being absolutely incapable of this peculiar feeling is not a complete moral being. Lastly, only voluntary action is personal action and only personal action can be moral. But voluntary action is inconceivable without desire. If a human being can rightly be said to act when his action does not spring in any degree from his own desire that action is not properly his own, and cannot with reference to him be pronounced either right or wrong. But whether man's nature is called moral because it has distinct faculties for moral action, or because its general faculties operate in the sphere of right and wrong, is immaterial. In either case moral action and moral character are distinguishable from everything else.[1]

4. *In what part of moral action do we discover its moral quality?* Not in the outward or physical part of it, for that may be the same when moral quality is wholly wanting, or is either good or bad. Nor is the moral quality of an act always to be found in the nature of its proximate end. For a man may do something with the direct purpose of benefiting his neighbor when his ultimate object is to benefit himself. He may intend to benefit his neighbor, while his real *motive* for so doing is the hope of good to himself. The truly moral quality of an act must be found in the motive or inward reason for it. If that be righteousness, the honor of God, or the welfare of a fellow-man, the motive is good and the act in a personal respect is right.

The great question therefore is this: Why is an act performed? What is the reason which leads the person to perform it? This cannot be separated from the ultimate object of the act, but it may often be wholly dis-

[1] See *Smith* (H. B.), "System of Christian Theology," p. 179; and *Tefft* (L.), "Institutes of Moral Philosophy," p. 66 ff.

tinct from its proximate object. In other words, the moral quality of an action depends upon *what is chosen by the soul as its ultimate object in that act.* If the soul enthrones God instead of self, and prefers his holy will to its own pleasure, its action is morally right; but if it enthrones self instead of God, and prefers its own pleasure to righteousness or the welfare of others, its action is morally wrong.

5. *Is this inward preference of the soul voluntary or involuntary, free or not free?* This is the question of the ages. Is man free in the very act of choosing? Does he *make* his preference or choice of the object of his life and action? Or is his preference determined for him by the moral constitution or condition of his soul? To obtain an answer to this question we may appeal to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, to the testimony of consciousness, and to the principle of causation or a sufficient reason.

(1) *The teaching of the Holy Scriptures* may be brought under five heads: the actual sinfulness of men, their first sin in Eden, their moral weakness, their moral obligation, and God's grace in relation to their weakness.

a. The teaching of the Scriptures as to the actual sinfulness of men is very clear and uniform. Men are not in their normal state as moral beings. They are habitually and consciously wrongdoers.

b. The teaching of the Scriptures as to the first sin represents it as the act of a man in his normal state, of a man who had been living in accord with God's will, and whose moral tendencies had been good rather than evil. His sin must therefore have been in the strictest sense voluntary, self-originated, free.

In saying this we do not forget the temptation which was encountered in Eden. But trial, testing, even through temptation by a wicked being, is no real excuse for sin. No apology can be made for a moral being who

does what is known by him to be wrong. However flattering the suggestion of evil may be made, however skilfully the reasons for transgression may be presented, to do what is known to be forbidden by God is simply sinful and inexcusable. A fallen angel may have spoken through the serpent, but the evil of transgression was not thereby diminished; for the act is not represented as one which either Adam or Eve thought it right to do. Selfishness was the only motive-principle appealed to by the tempter; and so they were self-condemned and ashamed after they had yielded to his suggestion.

But a question may be asked at this point: Is it as easy to rise as it is to fall — to regain a high position as to forfeit it — to come back into the path of duty as to wander from it — to turn evil into good as to turn good into evil? As Dr. Bushnell says, "to mend an egg as to break it"? The change of a good moral state into a bad one does certainly suggest the possibility of changing a bad moral state into a good one: but, at best, dubiously, and only at the cost of stupendous effort. For, in the domain of spirit, strenuous exertion is the price of virtue, and no mortal can reach the heights of moral excellence without a struggle. On the other hand, simple inaction is often sin, and moderate resistance to evil a step towards ruin. Hence the power of a holy being to commit sin does not necessarily imply the power of a sinful being to cease doing evil and begin doing well without divine aid.

c. The teaching of Scripture as to the moral weakness of sinful man: Jer. 13:23; 31:18; Eze. 36:26; Ps. 5:10; Matt. 7:18; John 6:44, 65; 15:5; Eph. 2:10; Phil. 2:13. These passages assume that there is no such thing as repentance for sin, or faith in Christ, or spiritual service of God, apart from divine help. And some of them express the view that sinful men are morally weak, so weak that they cannot — because they will not — seek the Lord and make him the joy of their souls. These are

not metaphysical statements, but practical; they do not refer to the freedom or slavery of the will, in a philosophical sense, but to the morally broken, irresolute, and feeble condition of man by reason of sin.

d. The teaching of Scripture as to the duty of sinful men. This is positive and clear, implying that their moral weakness is no excuse for their continuing in sin: Eze. 18:27, 31, 32; Matt. 11:28 f.; Acts 3:19. Thus the duty of sinners to repent and seek the Lord is plainly taught. Nay, more, sinners are commanded to make themselves a new heart, as they are elsewhere commanded to love God with all the heart. This then is the simple and constant duty of sinners, and hence it must be in some way within their power. But how can one be so weak as to need God's help in repenting, and yet be free, and, in an important sense, able to repent? It may be answered without doubt that their weakness is altogether sinful and therefore inexcusable; that their *cannot* is reducible to a *will not*. They freely choose to remain selfish, unholy, impenitent.[1]

e. The teaching of Scripture as to God's grace. Some of the texts alleged in proof of man's moral weakness speak of God's assistance or grace. Thus the Philippians were exhorted to work out their own salvation, because it was God who was working in them both to will and to work. Hence, the practical difficulty that a free, vigorous choice of evil is incompatible with a free vigorous choice of good, that a strong preference of self incapacitates one for a strong preference of God, is surmounted by divine grace; not by excusing the sinner but by granting him unmerited assistance, not by denying or taking away his freedom of choice but by so stirring up his moral nature and quickening his religious susceptibility that he will seek the Lord.

(2) *The testimony of consciousness.* This is com-

[1] See *Dr. Smalley* in "Theol. Tracts," III., p. 404.

monly regarded as the clearest evidence of freedom in choosing. Many writers pronounce it conclusive.

a. Sir Wm. Hamilton represents it as "the express affirmation, the unconditional testimony of consciousness, that we are, though we know not how, the true and responsible authors of our actions." [1] Again, "the doctrine of Moral Liberty cannot be made conceivable.... All that can be done is to show, — 1, that for the *fact* of liberty, we have, immediately or mediately, the evidence of consciousness; and, 2, that there are, among the phenomena of mind, many facts which we must admit as actual, but of whose possibility we are wholly unable to form any notion." A persuasion that our moral action is free, — that we are able in every instance to do right and refrain from wrong, seems to be instinctive and to flow from a consciousness of the fact. Moreover, as we look back upon a decision to do wrong, we seem to see that we could have decided otherwise.

> "So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
> So near is God to man.
> When duty whispers low, *thou must,*
> The youth replies, *I can.*" — R. W. Emerson.

b. But the testimony of consciousness to the freedom of the human will is sometimes denied and sometimes impeached as false.

Dr. Alexander (Arch.) remarks that "When we feel that we could and would act differently from what we have done, in certain specified circumstances, it is always on the supposition that our views and feelings should be different." [2]

There is certainly force in this remark. When we recall a decision made in the past, we do not usually recall our mental state in all respects. If we should do

[1] Philosophy of the Conditioned," p. 507; *Wight.*

[2] "Moral Science," p. 119.

this perfectly, we should doubtless see that our decision would now be the same as before. But the question is not, should we do the same thing again, if we were situated in every respect as we then were, but were we then conscious of a power to do otherwise, conscious of doing freely what we did, conscious of choosing this while able to choose that? This latter question we are disposed to answer in the affirmative. *In the very act of choice we know ourselves to be free. At the precise instant of deciding we feel ourselves uncompelled.* If we follow impulse, instead of reason, we do it of our own accord. If we obey conscience, instead of appetite, we feel that we could do the reverse.

(3) *The testimony of logic.* This is said by many to be inconsistent with moral freedom. If we are free we are so illogically, incomprehensibly.

a. To put the argument after the manner of Edwards: There must be in every good choice a right feeling or desire which gives character to the choice, and which is not originated by it. There can be no worthy choice of God as the highest good which does not include in itself a certain appreciation of him. Without love it is impossible to make him the end of action or the object of worship. The quality of love in the choice is precisely that which makes it virtuous. To suppose the love originated by the choice is to suppose an effect wholly unlike its cause — a good thing originated by something that has no goodness. Again, to suppose that God is chosen as the highest good when love to him is weaker than love to self, is to disregard the soul's estimate of the worth of objects and make it choose a less desirable instead of a more desirable object. Still more unreasonable is it to suppose that God is thus chosen by one who has no love to him.

Thus in seeking a sufficient reason for a holy choice we seem to find that it must be a holy desire in the person

choosing. And, therefore, if no such desire is in the sinner's heart, he will never choose aright. His immanent preference, his abiding inclination, being wrong, all his particular volitions will be wrong. Only if some divine influence work in his heart will he turn from sin and enter the way of holiness.

Lotze believes that "the *power to initiate a new series of events* exists in the free will of man, but that the way in which this comes to pass is inexplicable. The idea of determinism is perfectly clear and free from contradiction. But there is one, and only one, fact that can bring us to the thought of freedom — and that is the feeling of penitence and self-condemnation. The conception of an 'ought' and of an obligation has the most indubitable and incontrovertible significance" (condensed). The sum of his argument is, that necessity is logically clear, that freedom is inexplicable but not therefore incredible, that freedom is demanded by obligation, penitence, religion, and that it is limited, though sufficient to render men accountable and inexcusable for sin.

Schurman (J. G.) writes as follows: "Doubtless, if the category of causality is valid for mind, it must be admitted that volitions and actions are inexorably determined. But what ground is there for applying to persons what we know only as true for things? There is, in fact, none whatsoever, except the unifying impulse we follow in our scientific research. That everything should stand under one category is doubtless an ideal for knowing, but it is not on that account a condition of being... The will is desire with full-orbed eye of reason. It is thus the ground for distinction between acts that we perform and events that merely happen. It belongs to the inmost centre of our being, and as it is the pledge of our individuality, so is it the primal energy, of which we are directly conscious, but of which we can give no more description than of a color or sound."[1]

b. On the other hand, the word "occasion" or "condition" is scarcely strong enough to express the rela-

[1] "Kantian Ethics," pp. 47, 34.

tion between desire and choice. *Influence* appears to be a more exact expression for the bearing of the one upon the other. But influence is not constraint; it is consistent with freedom, and willing is always by its very nature free. In so far as any activity of mind is voluntary, it is free; in so far as it is involuntary it is not free. If there be inward constraint, compulsion, so that the soul is driven in a certain direction by a blind, strong impulse, the act is properly called involuntary. A madman is not a freeman. But blind impulse is entirely distinct from a deep moral preference or choice, which influences the whole life of a man consciously free. The one is passion, the other character.

6. *Is moral action equally voluntary, original, and free in all moral beings, good or bad?* By moral action is now meant the ultimate preference involved in choice, and expressed by it.

(1) This preference is profoundly voluntary, and however long it may be cherished it continues to be voluntary. No degree of progress in either holiness or sin can change its character in this respect. God is free; Gabriel is free; Satan is free. If the appeal be made to consciousness, the same answer will come from every moral being — from the youth of eighteen and the man of eighty. And if it be made to reason, no other answer is possible without undermining the foundations of moral government. For if the presence of moral bias or preference in the soul be incompatible with freedom, neither good nor bad men can be free; only those who are morally undecided, halting between two opinions, lukewarm, can be justly responsible for their conduct. As soon as they begin to have any character, disposition, or aim, they begin to lose their power of choice and to fall into the arms of necessity. This cannot be. Men of fixed habits and unwavering purpose are as ready to take the responsibility of their own conduct as are those

who halt between two opinions, being almost equally ready to adopt either.

(2) Nevertheless, to reverse a settled preference or choice is an arduous task. When a preference has been cherished until it is a habit of the soul, the circumstance that it is voluntary and therefore free does not render it weak. Habits have roots; a disposition long indulged cannot be easily removed. If it could be, a stable character would never be formed. Heaven would be impossible, as well as hell. Moral weakness would be normal and everlasting. But the reverse of this is true. Though choice never ceases to be free, it rapidly ceases to be fickle in a moral respect, so that the prophet's language seems scarcely hyperbolical. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil."

(3) The following propositions may be easily accepted as true, namely:—

a. *That every man has whatever power of will is necessary to make him justly responsible for the moral good or evil in his character and conduct.*

b. *That this power is inalienable, no degree of progress in holiness or sinfulness having any tendency to destroy it.* However holy Gabriel may be, he possesses it; however wicked Satan may be, he also possesses it.

c. *That even the moral bias of man's heart is in a most important sense voluntary, since all spiritual activity is at once intellectual, emotional, and voluntary.*

d. *That moral character, as a permanent thing, may be discovered most readily in the state of the moral susceptibilities and feelings,* — the permanent preference of the soul.

e. *That conscious choice and volition indorse, express, and deepen this character or these susceptibilities; while the latter in turn have great influence upon the former.*

f. *Hence, that virtue and sin cannot be traced wholly to either function of man's spirit, — to his moral taste or to his will.*

g. *Yet a certain power of choosing his end or aim in life appears to be the rational basis of responsibility.*

CHAPTER II

CHARACTER OF MANKIND

I. Mankind, as a Race, are Sinful

UNDER this head the following propositions will be discussed, *viz.:* The nature of sin; the fact that all men are sinful; and the fact that all men are not equally sinful.

1. *The nature of sin.* What is the spring of moral evil in men, the central impulse or aim, which leads men to all forms of wrong doing? It has been thought enough to say that sin is

(1) *Want of conformity to the law of God.*[1] This is supported by an appeal to several declarations of Scripture: 1 John 3:4; Matt. 13:41; Rom. 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:14; Rom. 2:25; 5:13; Heb. 2:2; Gen. 3:3, and to many biblical designations of sin.[2] According to this view of the case, sin is essentially disobedience.

But if the emphasis is laid on mere infraction of law, on mere disobedience without regard to the character and content of the rule the definition does not give us what we desire, *viz.,* the central impulse to wrong-doing, the

[1] See "Confession of Faith" of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, p. 186.

[2] See Trench, "New Testament Synonyms," p. 226 f. — ἁμαρτία, ἁμάρτημα, παρακοή, ἀνομία, παρανομία, παράβασις, παράπτωμα, ἀγνοήμα, ἥττημα. Aug. *"Factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem,"* Con. Faust XX., 27.

working principle of sin. For the love of lawlessness or disobedience is not a constant element in evil. Or if the emphasis is laid on the divineness of the law, on its being *God's* law, we are still moved to ask, *What* does God's law brand as sin? What is man forbidden by it to do? Can all which that law forbids be resolved into pride or traced back to pride as its source? The definition seems to be true, but scarcely sufficient for our purpose.

Sin has been defined, —

(2) *As concupiscence* or *inordinate desire.* And in this case also appeal is made to biblical testimony: Rom. 1:18 f.; 4:1; 7:8, 14, 18, 23, 24; 8:6 f.; Gal. 5:16 f.; Phil. 3:4; 1 Cor. 1:26; 3:1-4; 2 Cor. 1:12; cf. John 1:13; 3:6; Gen. 6:3. But Paul uses the words, "flesh," "fleshly," and the like, in these passages to denote man in his unrenewed state. They refer to the soul and its impulses as well as to the body and its appetites. The body may be both an occasion and an instrument of sin; yet sin no more originates in a bodily appetite than it does in the object which that appetite craves. A carnal or fleshly mind is one that is obedient to sinful impulses, to appetite, lust, pride, envy, wrath, and other evil affections, but sin originates in the heart: Prov. 4:23; Matt. 15:19.

Again, sin is defined, —

(3) *As deficiency of love to God and man.* In this case reference is made to certain words of Scripture, for example: Matt. 22:37-39; Luke 10:27, 28; Deut. 6:5; 10:12; 30:6, to the goodness of many acts performed by unrenewed men, and to God's relation to sin. Many acts of unrenewed men are believed to be sinful for no other reason than their lack of love to God. Sin is unreal, unsubstantial, it is not something but a want of something. This view is sometimes advocated by Augustine. But sin appears to be more than a lack of moral power, more than an absence of suitable love; it is

often positive, energetic, and hostile to good — hatred, instead of love.[1]

It has been defined, —

(4) *As preference of self to God.* A majority of modern theologians adopt this definition. And it is supported by many expressions of the Sacred Record: as, John 5:30; 7:18; 8:50; Matt. 20:28; 26:39; Rom. 15:3; 14:7; Gal. 2:20; 2 Cor. 5:15; Phil. 2:4, 21; 1 Cor. 10:24, 33; John 12:25; 1 Cor. 13:5; and also by a careful study of selfishness. For this impulse and affection will be found to comprehend self-indulgence, self-seeking, and self-will. And in these three forms, variously combined, preference of self will be seen to account for nearly and perhaps all sin.

The law says, Be in harmony with all that is, with all sentient being, with the ends for which all that is, exists. Since God is supreme, treat him as supreme. Since he is most holy and good, treat him as most holy and good. Since he is the sun, the source of all light and beauty and life, and you are but a dewdrop reflecting his radiance, treat him as sun and source, and yourself as but a tiny mirror. Moreover, since man is your peer, respect and love and treat him as as your peer. But selfishness says, Be indifferent to all but self, except so far as you can turn it to your account. Love thyself first. Make thyself the centre of thought, of purpose, and of action. Your own happiness is the only good for *you.* Let others take care of themselves. "Am I my brother's keeper?"

2. *All mankind are sinful.* There is evidence sufficient to justify the assertion that no member of the human race, with the exception of Jesus Christ, has es-

[1] *Non enim natura nostra boni tantum inops et vacua est; sed malorum omnium adeo fertilis et ferox, ut otiosa esse non potuit.* [*Calvin,* (J.), "*Institutio Religionis Christianæ,*" Lib., II., 1, 8, *prope finem.*]

caped the influence of sin. All are morally depraved at birth, and, if they live long in the world, become guilty of personal sin. By moral depravity is meant a state of the human soul which naturally leads to sin, and which can only be accounted for as the effect of ancestral sin.

(1) The Scriptures sometimes represent all men as sinful, 1 Kings 8:46; Eccl. 7:20; Rom. 3:9 f. Yet these passages may be supposed to refer to such only as have personally and consciously disobeyed the law of God.

(2) Again, the Scriptures sometimes include bodily death in the penalty of sin, as, Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12 f.; 1 Cor. 15:21, 22, 45 f.; and bodily death is the lot of all, young or old. Only two exceptions have been made to this rule, and such as are alive at the final coming of Christ will be changed without dying, so that their bodies will be incorruptible. Death is the rule.

(3) The Scriptures also represent the atonement as universal, 1 John 2:2; 1 Tim. 2:6; 4:10; Heb. 2:9; 1 Pet. 3:18; and if it was really provided for all, without exception, all must be in some way touched with the virus of sin. Even the youngest must by heredity have moral tendencies which are evil and need to be changed.

(4) The Scriptures appear to teach that man's nature is vitiated at birth since the fall of our first parents, see John 3:6; 1 Cor. 7:14; Eph. 2:3; Rom. 5;12 f.; 1 Cor. 15:22. This, at least, is the most obvious sense of these passages, and it should not be set aside, without clear evidence of inconsistency with known facts, or other teaching of Scripture.[1]

The language of profane writers is also worthy of notice in this connection. Ovid says, "We always strive after what is forbidden, and covet what is denied." And Seneca remarks that "We have all sinned, some more and some less;

[1] But see an interesting discussion of this subject in "The Origin of Sin," by Rev. E. W. Cook, A.M.

some of set purpose, others impelled by chance or borne away by another's wickedness. Some of us have persisted in good with too little energy, and, unwilling, resisting, have lost our innocence. Nor do we sin only; but we shall sin to the end of life." [1]

If all men are either morally depraved or sinful at birth, it must be in consequence of the apostasy in Eden; for Christians agree in teaching that man was originally upright. As he came from the hand of his Creator, he was inclined to good rather than to evil; but since the fall all men are predisposed to evil.

3. *All mankind are not equally sinful.*

(1) For the Scriptures teach that the sinfulness of some men is much greater than that of others, and especially that it is modified by the religious knowledge given to men. See, Prov. 29:1; Jer. 13:23; Luke, 12:48; John 3:19; 15:22, 24; 2 Tim. 3:13; Rom. 2:12; 4:15; 5:13; 1 Cor. 14:20. Compare Prov. 1:24 f.; Matt. 18:3; 19:14; Mark 10:14; Luke 18:16; Eze. 16:47-52; Matt. 10:15; 11:22; John 19:11; 1 Tim. 5:8; 2 Peter 2:20, 21; Amos 3:2.

(2) Yet there is a sense in which all unrenewed men are totally depraved, namely, in the sense that they have no proper love to God, Rom. 8:7; 1 John 4:7; and, as love to God is required in every part of life and is found in no part of it, the very principle of holy obedience is *entirely* wanting. Moreover, as selfishness reigns in the unrenewed heart, there is latent or conscious enmity to God in every such heart. Let the nature of God be revealed, as opposed to all self-indulgence, self-seeking, and self-will, and this latent enmity will emerge into conscious action. A state of indifference will be no longer possible. Total depravity in this use of the expression is perfectly consistent with degrees of sinfulness and of guilt; but the expression is liable to be misunderstood.

[1] "Clementia," c. 7, cf. c. 23.

(3) The same conclusion will be reached by a study of man's accountability for his moral life or conduct. We may look at this in the light of reason and conscience, and say, in general, that every man, as a moral being, is accountable for whatever sin he commits or countenances. Hence:—

a. *He is accountable for every voluntary act of his own that is wrong.* By a *voluntary* act is meant a choice or volition, and by a *wrong* act, one that does not agree with the will of God as known to the actor. The wrongness of a choice or volition may be said to be revealed to a man, whenever conscience, or Scripture, or Providence has put within his reach a knowledge of the character of that act. For a refusal to receive the light, or a neglect to seek it, leaves him without excuse when his choice or act is wrong.

b. *Every man becomes accountable for an inherited inclination to evil which he appropriates by doing a sinful act.* By "appropriates" we mean accepts as his motive to the act. For whatever may be thought of his relation to an impulse of his heart which he has never consented to follow, there should be no hesitation in admitting that he is responsible for that impulse to evil when he has decided to obey it, has taken it for his guide; for by so doing he has virtually said, "This is *my* desire, and I will gratify it"; "evil be thou my good!" Henceforth let him never plead that "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" are an evil inheritance for which he is to give no account.

c. *Every man is accountable for any increase of inclination to evil in his heart which is due to his sinful action.* If by conscious choice or volition one indorses and expresses a tendency of his heart to sin, he also by the same act deepens and strengthens that tendency, and for this addition to the power of evil in his nature he is certainly accountable to God. If he reënforces an enemy

to good which he ought rather to defeat and disarm, he must answer for it before the Lord of all by whom he is commanded to be holy.

d. *Every person sinning is responsible for all the evil which may be expected by him to result from his sin.* Reason makes the spirit and intent of the agent the principal source of his guilt in a sinful act, and suggests that the natural consequences of such an act may be averted by the providence of God or may be rendered unexpectedly dreadful by the concurrent wickedness of other men. But the real nature of many sins is most clearly manifested by their consequences. And therefore the wisdom of God has forewarned us of those natural consequences. So far as this has been done, a wrong-doer is justly held accountable for them, — whether they do in fact flow from his action or are averted by the merciful hand of Providence.

Thus far we have looked in but one direction, that is, at the positive increase of evil by a sinner's conduct — at sin as represented by wrong propensities, affections, and volitions. But we must now look in an opposite direction and note the effect of sinning upon one's *capacity for good.*

e. *A sinner is accountable for any lack of improvement in his capacity for moral and religious feeling and action, in so far as this lack of improvement is occasioned by his sinful conduct.* This is a grave responsibility, and not without the best of reasons should we blame a moral being for the good which he might have done, as well as for the evil which he does — for his neglect to improve his capacities for right living and their consequent lack of growth, as well as for his use of capacities for wrong action and their consequent increase. But if man's nature is not fixed, but vital and crescent, if he is a being capable of progress in power for good or evil, it is self-evident that his capacities are talents to be aug-

mented by use, and that his Lord will hold him accountable for failing to become as great and good as he could have become by doing always the best he could do. In a life of sin the best powers and susceptibilities are unemployed. Germs of holy discrimination and feeling are undeveloped. Talents lent to man for the service of God are hid in a napkin. And it cannot be doubted that the Most High will reckon this against his unfaithful servant.

f. *A sinner is responsible for any deterioration of his capacity for moral and religious discernment, feeling, and conduct, when this deterioration is caused by his own sinful action.* It may be assumed that spiritual powers are injured by sin. The further one goes in rebellion against God, the duller becomes his spiritual vision, and the weaker his susceptibility to holy influences. For this the sinner is accountable, inasmuch as it is a well-known effect of wrong doing.

g. *A sinner is responsible for his failure to do all the good he might have done if he had never performed an unworthy act, but had always used every faculty and susceptibility of his nature for good and for nothing but good.* The essence of the divine law is a demand, not a prohibition; hence more sin may often be committed by neglecting to answer that demand, than by doing what is prohibited. It is holy service that God requires — love to himself and love to his creatures — and a great part of human sin consists in withholding this love.

The sinner is therefore culpable for every choice of evil, for the inclination to evil which he accepts by that choice, for the growth of that inclination in consequence of the choice, for the foreseeable evil resulting from the choice, for the non-improvement of his capacity for good involved in that choice, for the deterioration of his capacity for good consequent on the choice, and for his failure because of it to do all the good he might otherwise have done; in a word, for all the difference between what he

has actually done in life, and become in spiritual power and excellence, and what he might have done in life, and become in spiritual power, if he had been holy from the first. This seems to be a simply rational indictment against him as an unfaithful steward of God. And it is therefore self-evident that all men are not equally sinful.

But every man is a member of the human family. His social relations are at the same time moral, and it is necessary to call attention to his responsibility from this point of view.

Is, then, a man responsible in any degree for the sinful action of others which he countenances, and merely countenances? (Cf. Rom. 1 : 32.)

1. That he is responsible for countenancing the sinful act of another will not be denied; for this assent to wrong-doing is his own spiritual act, the smile of his soul upon sin. But how can a man be accountable for an act with which he has had no causal connection? Can ten thousand persons be guilty of a crime that was perpetrated by one? We can only answer by saying that in some cases there seems to be nothing but justice in taking the will for the deed, if the guilt of human action must be found in the will rather than in the deed, that is, in the motive and intent rather than in the outward or even the mere voluntary act. Hence we must beware of limiting any man's responsibility to what he actually does, as if efficient causation were the sole ground of accountability. For one may have in his heart a desire which leads naturally to a sinful act, and which would render the act sinful if performed, and yet not perform the act himself, but simply countenance it in another, or say amen to it as performed ages ago.

2. But assent to sin is rarely an act of the soul with no influence on others. For men are not alone in the world, and no mask is thick enough to hide one from his fellows. The workings of the human heart flow through

many channels to kindred hearts. The assent of a soul to evil-doing finds its way to evil-doers and encourages them in their work. The wicked would scarcely dare to be vile or profane, were it not for the silent assent of their more prudent allies. If the ungodly were encompassed by men whose innermost nature condemned all sin, they would surely know and feel this, though no word were spoken. So, likewise, assent to sin, though not avowed to the sinner, is almost certain to be divined by him, silencing the voice of his conscience for past sin, or emboldening him to act against that voice in the future. Thus in truth a million hearts may be guilty of murder, though but one hand performs the deed. Nor will the guilt of the million be increased or diminished by the temporal relation of their assent to the deed of sin. An assent after the deed is just as full of evil as an assent before the deed. An absolutely perfect Ruler must often treat the instigator of a crime as equally guilty with the perpetrator of it, and must sometimes pronounce the man who cries, "All hail!" to the wrong-doer even more culpable than the wrong-doer himself.

3. We do not overlook a certain difference between the doer of a bad action and the man who assents to it; but in spite of this difference, each of them will be held accountable for the wrong of the deed *in proportion to the interest which he feels in its accomplishment.* For the tie which binds one to an act of holiness or of sin is moral as well as causal; it is in the spirit, the preference, the aim of the soul, as well as in the act which reveals the spirit and aim.

4. Must we not, then, go a step further, and say that in the deepest sense, all sin is *one* in principle, and all sinners an alliance of evil-doers, in antagonism to God and holiness? That every man who commits one sin enters that alliance and associates himself in a measure with all sinners and all sin, past, present, and future,

becoming thereby accountable for all, though only in proportion to the depth of his sympathy with evil? There is something profoundly interesting in this view of the moral gravity of life, as determined by our relations to the human race. No one lives for himself. Every man is his brother's keeper.

5. To all this must be added that no man needs to work alone; every one may have the assistance of God, as well as of man and of nature. He must therefore be responsible not only for what he can do standing alone, but for what he can do by his own power coupled with all available help from God and man and nature. He is a co-worker, and is expected to seek and to have the aid of others in performing the task set him by the Lord of all. To refuse help may be to decline doing what he ought to do. To refuse seeking help, when that is the proper way of obtaining it, is to incur the responsibility of failure and sin.

6. Man's true life and blessedness are multiplied a hundred fold by his relation to beings of the same race and nature with himself. And who can prove that this advantage could have been given him without corresponding peril? Who can say that the obedience of the fathers could be remembered, to the benefit of the children, a thousand generations, unless the sins of the fathers were, by the action of general laws, visited upon the children to the third and fourth generation of them that hate God?

7. But sympathy with mankind is a matter of growth, whether that sympathy be with the evil or with the good. And, therefore, by a study of man's responsibility for sinful conduct, in the light of his relation to God merely, or in the light of his relation to his brothers also, we are confirmed in our position that all men are not equally sinful, inasmuch as all men have not, and are not accountable for having, the same degree of sympathy with sin in others. Sinfulness of character is variable, and far more inveterate in some than in others.

CHAPTER III

CONDITION OF MANKIND

I. Mankind, as Truly Sinful, are Guilty and Condemned

THIS proposition has been partially considered in showing the degree of sinfulness in mankind. For in order to show their increasing sinfulness we pointed out the spiritual action for which, as moral beings, they are justly held responsible. It is not necessary to repeat that discussion. We may now assume that men, as they go on in disobedience to God, are condemned by him as guilty in the particulars there stated.

But are they in any way accountable for the sin of their first parents? If so, in what way and to what extent? The subject is one of great difficulty because of the intimate and mysterious connection between all the members of the human race. Looking at the question historically we find six leading hypotheses on the subject.

1. *The Pelagian hypothesis* assumes that a man cannot be responsible for anything except his own voluntary action. It asserts and emphasizes "the power of contrary choice," — the *possibilitatem utriusque partis.* And it holds that Adam and Christ are set forth in Rom. 5 : 12 f. as typical personages, who illustrate the divinely established connection between sin and death, righteousness and life. This hypothesis looks upon every man as an individual, and lays no stress upon heredity or the race connection, in estimating guilt. It minimizes sin to the utmost, and may, without injustice, be said to take a somewhat superficial view of human life and character.

2. *The Arminian hypothesis* supposes man to be responsible for his own voluntary action. It takes a deeper view of sin than the Pelagian theory allows, and admits that, since the fall, and owing to the fall, men are born "without original righteousness," morally powerless, and needing "new grace," but not guilty. It teaches that men are made responsible for the right and wrong of their conduct by a *gracious ability* imparted by God.[1]

"It is not," says Dr. Whedon, "until there is redemptively conferred upon man what we call a *gracious ability* for the right that man can strictly be responsible for the wrong." "It is as a depraved being that man becomes an ego; but instantly after, in the order of nature, he is met by the provisions of the atonement. If he is not thereby immediately unconditionally justified and regenerated, his death before the commission of actual sin would place him out of the category of condemnation."

Dr. Whedon supposes that Adam and Christ are represented as "federal heads" of mankind in Rom. 5 : 12 f., but only "conceptually," or by a "legal fiction."[2] This theory vindicates human freedom and accountability by assuming a gift of grace not revealed in the Scriptures, and by calling that "grace" which seems almost a debt.

3. *The Edwardean hypothesis* affirms that man is responsible for all his voluntary action, and that he has a *natural ability* to do right, though his inclination to sin leads him always to do wrong. It denies that men are responsible for any inherited inclination or bias, and holds that they are only responsible for the action by which they freely appropriate and express such an inclination. Hence men are born depraved, but not sinful, loaded with

[1] Bib. Sac. XIX., p. 241 f.

[2] That is, "an assumption of a possible thing as a fact irrespective of its truth." (*Webster.*)

misfortune but not with guilt. Their guilt begins with moral action; and this, owing to their innate bias to evil, is always sinful. This hypothesis regards Adam and Christ in Rom. 5: 12 f. as sources of inclination to evil, in the one case, and to good, in the other. It differs from the Arminian theory by affirming *natural* ability instead of *gracious* ability, but its *natural* ability is said to be practically crippled by *moral* inability. It is, however, consistent with the doctrine of election, while that of gracious ability is not.

4. *The Placean hypothesis* supposes that men are accountable for all the sin which they commit, or desire to commit, or indorse in others by sympathy of aim and spirit. It supposes that all men share with Adam in the corruption of nature caused by the fall, that they are directly charged with this corruption which they have, and, through this, with the sin which caused it and is indorsed by it. Adam and Christ are set forth in Rom. 12 f. as the sources, respectively, of sin and death, righteousness and life.

But how is it any more reasonable to hold men accountable for an innate sinful bias than for the sin which originated that bias? Or to hold them indirectly accountable for the apostacy of our first parents than to hold them directly responsible for it? Yet there are several passages of Scriptures which accord well with this theory, e. g. Ex. 20: 5, 6.

5. *The Augustinian hypothesis* makes every man responsible for his moral bias, as well as action, and a *particeps criminis* in every case where his heart assents to a sinful action. Advocates of this theory generally accept the *traducian* view of the origin of human souls, as well as of human bodies. And they emphasize the *oneness* of the human race, saying with Augustine, "We were all in that one man (Adam), since we were all that one man who lapsed into sin through the woman that

was made from him previous to transgression. The form in which we were to live as individuals had not, indeed, been created and assigned to us, man by man; but that seminal nature from which we were to be propagated was in existence." Adam and Christ are supposed to be represented in Rom. 5: 12 f. as the sources, though in a somewhat different sense, the one of sin and death, the other of righteousness and life.

The great merit of this hypothesis is supposed to be, that it justifies the imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity, since it was their sin as really as it was his. Their spiritual nature was germinally in his, and willed in his willing, sinned in his sinning. The fall was the fall of the entire race, for the spiritual substance of all human souls was then in his soul. By Adam is meant, according to Shedd, Adam and Eve, for human nature is not man or woman separately, but man and woman united. "Each of us, as an individual," says Ernest Naville, "is only personally responsible for his personal acts, or to speak more exactly, for the personal part of his acts. But each of us, inasmuch as he is man, is jointly and severally (*solidairement*) responsible for the fall of the human race." [1]

But it may be questioned whether the descendants of Adam, as separate persons, have any sense of guilt for what their *nature* did in the person of Adam and Eve. What the traducian theory does explain is the moral condition of mankind since the fall: it scarcely explains why men should be charged with sin for being in that condition.

6. *The Calvinistic hypothesis* supposes that every man is responsible for his depraved heart and sinful conduct. Adam and Christ, by divine appointment, were federal heads or representatives, the former of all his descendants, the latter of all his chosen. According to this

[1] "The Problem of Evil," p. 192.

theory, Adam's apostacy is imputed to all his posterity, and they are held responsible for it, because he acted for them as well as for himself. This view is said to account for the moral condition in which men are born, *i.e.*, for their bias to evil. It is also said to agree with the evident meaning of Paul's language in the fifth of Romans, and with the family constitution. But it seems to be more legal than spiritual; it goes but a little way in satisfying our reason; and it puts justification before faith, while the New Testament makes faith a condition of justification, and therefore logically prior to it.

Something may easily be said against every one of these hypotheses. And evidently the connection of the race with Adam, and of believers with Christ, brings into the problem of imputation a great part of the difficulty which it offers to the human understanding. But we may safely say as much as this, that every child of Adam is accountable for the degree of sympathy which he has with the whole system of evil in the world, and with the primal act of disobedience among men. If that sympathy is full, whether it be expressed by deed or thought, if the whole force of his being is arrayed against heaven and on the side of hell, it is difficult to limit his responsibility.

Moreover, since physical death has, to some extent, a penal character, and is a consequence of Adam's sin, the Pelagian hypothesis must be decisively rejected. For the descendants of Adam unquestionably inherit from him a moral nature inclined to evil. Their race connection with him is most intimate and far-reaching in its effects for good and ill. How the ill effects are treated in the divine administration must be considered from many points of view before the fulness of truth will be apprehended.

By saying that unrenewed men are *condemned* as well as *guilty,* we call attention to the fact that God is an omniscient Ruler who always looks upon men as they are,

and estimates their conduct at its true value. He that believes not is condemned already. But not finally and irrevocably. Forgiveness is possible, but only on condition of repentance.

II. Mankind Unrenewed, Are Exposed to Future Punishment Without Prospect of Relief

Law is more than advice, more than persuasion; it is a rule of duty, sanctioned and sustained by rewards and punishments; that is, by the will and action of the Ruler, as well as by his character. God not only pleads for obedience, he demands it. He is not only pleased with those who render it, but displeased with those who do not. And as his approval finds expression in his treatment of those who obey, his disapproval finds expression in his treatment of those who disobey. Otherwise, his action would not truly represent his character. It would be inconsistent with his own nature to treat the wicked just as he does the righteous, to show just as much favor to those who despise him and forsake his holy ways, as he does to those who love him and seek to do his will. "If there is one feeling," writes De Pressensé, "more universal than another, it is the recognition of a retributive justice which annexes pain to wrong-doing and happiness to well doing."

1. The primary and leading sense of punishment is *suffering by loss or pain inflicted by rightful authority upon wrong-doers.* It looks at the past, as well as the future; its aim is retributive as well as reformative. It rests upon the postulate, that government ought to make a distinction between crime and innocence, that evil-doers ought not to receive the same treatment as those who do well. "If every crime is a fit object of punishment, and infers to some extent a forfeiture of happiness, it is a contradiction and absurdity to say that a crime requires

punishment because the transgressor has injured his own happiness; yet this is the whole conception of crime according to the utilitarian system." [1] But in the divine government, as well as in human governments, punishment may look to the future also by way of preventing sin or crime. This is a second reason for it, and perhaps the chief reason in the case of human governments that cannot search the hearts of transgressors, and estimate fairly their blameworthiness.

But "some have asked," remarks Thoreau, "Cannot reward be substituted for punishment? Is hope a less powerful incentive to action than fear?... This reasoning is absurd. Does a man deserve to be rewarded for refraining from murder?" In the divine government both hope and fear are appealed to in behalf of righteousness. "It is certainly consistent with the divine goodness," argues the Younger Edwards, "that sin exists in the world, otherwise it would never have existed. Now, since sin is in the world, if God were never to punish it, it would seem that he is no enemy to it. Or, if he punishes it in a far less degree than it deserves, still it would seem that his displeasure at it is far less than it is and ought to be. Nor can mere words or verbal declarations of the Deity sufficiently exhibit his opposition to sin, so long as he uniformly treats the righteous and the wicked in the same manner." [2]

2. The two elements of punishment are without doubt *loss* and *pain*. These comprise the sum total of natural evil which God annexes to moral evil. They are represented in the Bible by various expressions, more or less figurative, but all referable to these two kinds of evil. And it is in no one's power to imagine any natural evil which is not embraced in the idea of loss or forfeiture and of pain. Many biblical expressions relating to the penal consequences of sin contain a reference to both

[1] *Bowne*, "Metaphysics and Ethics," p. 98.
[2] Bib. Sac. 1886, p. 199.

kinds of natural evil. This is true of those which represent the wicked as being ultimately cast into the lake of fire, or into the outside darkness, or as going from the judgment into eternal punishment; very likely, it is true, of the terms death, perdition, and being lost.

To Christians who know something of fellowship with God, of the sweetness of his love and of love to him, of his tender compassion and self-sacrifice in the person of Jesus Christ, and of the enticing fields of spiritual light and progress open to believers in all the ages to come, the loss which is incurred by final unbelief must seem the greatest of evils. But to unbelievers who have never tasted and seen that the Lord is good, pain may appear to be the worst of evils. Loss of communion with God, loss of holy joy, they may not appreciate, though, as moral beings, they cannot be without some faint conception of it. But of pain they are often conscious and can therefore imagine how undesirable it is.

3. There is no reason to believe that the final penalty of sin, though in all cases an expression of God's displeasure with sinners because of their sins, will be inflicted by him directly. It is rather to be inferred from what we know of human souls that their punishment will be in a sense self-inflicted, that is, inflicted by the working of their own spiritual powers. Reason, memory, and conscience will condemn and torment them for wrong-doing. The only associates which they will consent to have will be unworthy and mean. Their own enormous and irrepressible selfishness will be matched by the selfishness of their comrades in misery. Whether they remain of free choice outside the golden city, or are forbidden to enter it by an authority which they no longer despise, the continued activity of the spiritual powers which make them men will probably be the principal source of pain. Conscience will be God's minister in that world as it often is in this.

Poets sometimes teach the deepest truth.

"The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven."
—MILTON.

"Conscience is harder than our enemies,
Knows more, accuses with more nicety."
— GEORGE ELIOT.

Yet it cannot be regarded as improbable that physical environment may have some part in the punishment of the lost, though the imagery of the Bible does not warrant any positive declaration on the point.

Although we are now speaking of the future and final punishment of sin, to which men are exposed unless they repent, we do not overlook the fact that they have a foretaste of punishment in this life. It is, however, a strictly merciful foretaste, akin in its purpose to the chastisement inflicted on Christians.

Other views. There are many Christians who do not think that unrenewed men are exposed to endless punishment. They find it hard to reconcile such a fact with the wisdom or love of God. And they believe that future punishment will issue in the annihilation of the wicked, or in their final restoration to holiness and bliss. The former of these opinions, under the name of "Conditional Immortality," has at the present time many advocates, and is worthy of close examination. They regard —

(1) *Extinction of conscious being as the final destiny of disbelievers in Christ.* This belief is defended on several distinct grounds, partly rational and partly scriptural.

a. On the ground that endless loss and pain are too severe a punishment for temporal sin.

But we do not look upon them as a punishment for merely temporal sin. There is such a thing as persistent,

eternal sin, and for this alone will punishment be without end: Mark 3:29. "Eternal punishment is not a measure of God's resentment against a single sin, which is so enormous that the resentment never abates. It is the result of any sin, or course of sin, in fixing the sinful state beyond recovery." [1]

b. On the ground that a permanently sinful and miserable being would be worse than useless to himself or others, marring forever the peace and order of the universe.

But this is an unstable ground, both because of the existence of sin and suffering for many ages already, and because of our inability to compass the universe in our view and decide what is, and what is not, useful.

c. On the ground that eternal life is the fruit of union with Christ: John 4:14; 20:26, 27, 28; 14:6.

Everything depends on the idea which was meant to be expressed by the words "eternal life," or "life in Christ." We suppose these words denote a quality or fulness of life which can only be realized in Christ, and not mere conscious existence. Union with Christ is not necessary to personal existence here; why must it be hereafter?

d. On the ground that death naturally signifies the end of conscious existence, and that the words of Scripture have presumptively their ordinary literal sense. Neither of these statements can be accepted without large qualification. It cannot be proved that among the Jews, in the time of Christ, "death" usually signified the end of conscious existence. Only the Sadducees believed this. Nor did the Greeks and Romans deny a shadowy existence after death. Equally unsafe is it to assume that the language of Scripture is not largely figurative. Every word and paragraph must be cautiously examined and interpreted, as in the case of other ancient books.

[1] *Gould* on Mark, p. 66.

e. On the ground that there are passages which deny conscious existence to men after death: Ps. 6:6; 30:10; 88:11-13; 115:17; Eccl. 9:10; Isa. 38:18, 19; (cf. Jer. 51:57; 1 Thess. 4:13 f.). But some of these passages speak of the righteous as well as of the wicked, and therefore prove too much, if they prove what is claimed. Nearly all of them are from poetic books of the Old Testament. Some of them may not represent inspired teaching. And finally there are clear passages in the New Testament which speak of the conscious existence of both good and bad men after death: Luke 16:19-31; 23:43; Heb. 12:23; 2 Pet. 2:9.

f. On the ground that other terms besides death, used to connote the punishment of the wicked, singnify extinction of personal being, as *destruction* or *perdition:* Matt. 10:6, 42; 15:24; Luke 11:51; 13:33; 15:4, 6, 8, 9, 17, 25, 32; 19:10; John 6:39; 10:28; 17:12; 2 Pet. 3:6, and other expressions. A study of these passages will show that the word does not with any uniformity, if at all, mean extinction of being. *Lake of fire:* Matt. 5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 13:42, 50; 18:8, 9; 23:33; 25:41; Mark 9:43-48; Rev. 20:10, 14, 15; 21:8; Luke 16:23, 24. It is pretty evident that the idea of suffering, rather than that of annihilation, is prominent in these passages. *Consumed or devoured:* Isa. 1:28; Ps. 37:20; Heb. 10:27. Temporal evils are probably referred to, earthly possessions consumed. See other passages: Gen. 31:40; Ps. 31:10, 11; 39:11; 69:10; Jer. 14:12; Gal. 5:15; Mark 12:40. *Burned up* and similar expressions: Ps. 21:10; 97:3; Mal. 4:1; Matt. 3:10; 13:40; John 15:6; Heb. 6:8; 10:27; 12:29; Rev. 20:9; but compare Ps. 102:4; Job 30:30; 1 Kings 8:51; Deut. 4:20; Jer. 11:4; Eze. 22:19-22; 1 Pet. 1:7; 4:12; 1 Cor. 3:15; Num. 21:28; Lam. 4:11. The words are often used in a figurative sense, and frequently to denote vengeance on those who still exist.

We do not find in the use of these figurative terms any solid ground for the theory in question. *Cut off:* Ps. 34:17; 37:9, 22, 28; but compare Isa. 53:8; Dan. 9:26; Job 6:9; Ps. 88:17; Matt. 24:50, 51. The words "cut off" appear to refer in almost all these texts to natural death; and it is hasty to infer from them the extinction of the soul *along with* the death of the body. *Brought to nought:* Ps. 37:10, 36; Job 7:21; 20:8; 8:22; Obad. 16; Isa. 41:11, 12; Jer. 10:24 (but compare Isa. 40:17; Ps. 39:5; 1 Cor. 7:19; 8:4; 2 Cor. 12:11; Gal. 6:3; Acts 5:36; Mark 9:12). The former passages seem to speak of temporal judgments. Moreover the same form of speech is used in respect to the righteous and the wicked. And besides, the language is emotional rather than didactic, and hyperbolical rather than restrained.

It seems to us, therefore, that this hypothesis rests on unstable foundations. And it is furthermore open to criticism on the ground that, if the penalty of sin is a loss of conscious being, that loss is the least evil to the most sinful, or rather it is the greatest gain to them, though it is a good rather than an evil to all the wicked. For, according to the belief of the advocates of this hypothesis, to live on, sinful and unforgiven, is a worse evil than extinction of being.

(2) *The final restoration of all to holiness,* or the doctrine of "the larger hope," is supported by the same twofold argument, an appeal to reason and to Scripture.

a. The endless presence of sin and suffering in the universe is pronounced irreconcilable with the wisdom and love of God. Omnipotent wisdom and love will not permit such evils to be permanent. This is plausible; but evidently we cannot determine, from our finite position, what omnipotence and love may permit in the realm of moral freedom, except as we study what has been permitted. Sin and pain have been permitted for periods of vast duration, and it is therefore rash for any finite

understanding to conclude that they cannot be allowed to continue forever.

b. The utter extinction of sin and suffering is predicted by the Holy Scriptures through the ultimate triumph of grace. This prediction is found in the writings of Paul, but not, with any clearness, in the words of Jesus, or of any of his apostles, except Paul; and we are constrained to believe that Paul did not intend to teach what is, perhaps, the literal and *prima facie* meaning of his language. It certainly depicts a vast extension of the reign of Christ in the hearts and lives of men. See Rom. 5:19; 11:25, 32; 14:12; 1 Cor. 15:28, 29; Phil. 2:9-11; Col. 1:20.

But when we compare these expressions with Col. 1:23; Matt. 3:5, and Mark 1:5, the possibility of a modified interpretation is forced upon our attention, *i. e.*, the possibility that he meant to predict the establishment of perfect order through Christ — a vast majority of mankind being brought into loving submission to him, and all the rest, together with Satan and his angels, being deprived of opportunity, if not of motive, to disturb his government. And when we compare the words of the Apostles with certain other statements of Scripture, *e. g.*, 2 Thess. 1:8, 9; Rom. 2:12; 1 Cor. 6:9, 10; Eph. 5:5, 6; 1 Cor. 16:22; Gal. 5:19-21; 1 Pet. 4:17, 18; Rev. 22:15, some limitation of the literal force of the Universalistic passages seems unavoidable.

c. It is therefore certain that ungodly men are exposed to punishment which will continue as long as they continue to be ungodly. Moral evil will always be followed by natural evil. Sin will always be witnessed against by loss and pain. The two are correlative in the whole universe of God. And both must be consistent with the love as well as the holiness of God.

"In the place we call hell, eternal love as really is as in the place we call heaven, though in the one case it is the com-

placency or pleasure in the holy and the happy which seems like the brightness of everlasting sunshine or the glad music of waves that break into the perennial laughter, but in the other it is the compassion or pity for the bad and the miserable which seems like a face shaded with everlasting regret, or the muffled weeping of a sorrow too deep to be heard." [1]

But natural evil is not simply retributive. It has also a beneficent office, or, rather, a double action, retributive and beneficent, beneficent in many cases, because retributive. This is true of physical toil and suffering and death. The cloud of misery which overshadows human life has silver linings. The shortness of life and its uncertain duration, the hardness and sterility of the soil, the desolation and terror occasioned by pestilence and earthquake and tornado, are preventives of moral evil and means of moral improvement.

Says Prof. George I. Chace, "Even death, the king of terrors, considered with reference to this world only, is not an unmixed evil. It is the great equalizer of the diversities of human fortune. It at the same time reconciles the poor man to his poverty, and makes the rich feel of how little value is his wealth. It chastens aspiration, moderates desire, subdues selfishness, quickens benevolence, strengthens duty, and disposes to the exercise of every Christian virtue. It is the moral ballast of society. But for its restraining and steadying effect, the noblest institutions, freighted with the hopes of the race, would quickly be dashed to pieces on the rocks of interest, or whelmed beneath the billows of passion."

Still more could be said of the beneficent mission of toil in consequence of the hardness and sterility of the ground. For men to whom self-indulgence is a second nature, the garden of Eden would be a temptation instead

[1] "Religion in History and in Modern Life," *Fairbairn* (A. M.), pp. 152, 153.

of a temple, an occasion to vice instead of worship. For there is abundant truth in the saying, that "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do." Most fortunate is it for the moral as well as the religious nature of men that their bodily wants are so imperative in their demands. For they can minister to those wants in themselves and their families with a good conscience, often tasking their powers severely to do what they know to be their duty. What reason is there to believe they would meanwhile avoid courses of sin, if they had not these tasks to fulfill?

It is unnecessary to consider other instances. Physical toil and pain and death might not be useful to holy beings. They would be perhaps a mystery if there were no sinners in the world. But it is seen that, during a period of moral probation, some degree of penal suffering is better for sinners than unmixed prosperity. For it operates, on the one hand, as a reminder of sin, and on the other as a timely and gracious warning, having in it the possibility, if not the promise, of true life forever. Its retributive nature is the source of its beneficent power; *the fact that it is a token of God's displeasure with sin is the reason why it acts as a warning against sin and as an argument for holiness.* Till probation ends and the possibility of recovery disappears, penal evil has always two aspects, retributive and reformatory, severe and gracious.

Appendix

Reference has been made, in speaking of creation, of providence, and of the fall, to moral beings called Angels, who appear to have been regarded by the Saviour as having more or less to do with mankind, but not as being members of the human family nor as having genetic relations to one another. Their existence offers a wide outlook to students who are interested in the vastness and variety of the created universe, but is specially important because of their connection with the government of God over human beings. When it is said by Jesus Christ that "Lazarus died and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom," and also, in his picture of the final judgment, to those on his left hand, "Depart from me, accursed, into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels," no one is permitted to doubt the wisdom of giving a brief examination to the

Biblical Doctrine of Angels [1]

It may be premised (1) that the word "angels" is here used to denote rational beings distinct from mankind; (2) that our knowledge of such beings is derived

[1] See on the whole subject, *Ode* (J.), "Commentarius de Angelis," 1739; *Twesten* (A. D. C.), "Dogmatik," II, 305-383, in Bib. Sac. I, 768-793, II, 108-140; *Mayor* (L.), "Scriptural Idea of Angels," in Am. Bib. Repos., Oct. 1838, XII, 356-388; *Stuart* (M.), "Sketches of Angelology in the Old and New Test.," Bib. Sac. I, 88-154; *Whately* (R.), "Scripture Revelations respecting Good and Evil Angels"; *Timpson* (T.), "The Angels of God; their Nature, Character, Ranks," etc., 2d ed., London, 1847; *Rawson* (J.), "Nature and Ministry of the Holy Angels," N. Y.,

from the Bible alone; (3) that the Bible speaks of them because of their connection with men in certain relations and events; (4) that Satan and demons will be regarded as fallen angels; and (5) that other applications of the term "angels" will not be considered in this place. See Gen. 16:7, 10, 13; 18:13 sq.; Eccl. 5:6; Isa. 42:19; Mal. 3:1; 1 Sam. 11:3; Ps. 104:4.

1. *The nature of angels;* or, in other words, their *essence,* their *power,* and their *knowledge.*

(1) The *essence* or *substance* of angels. It has been commonly believed by Christians that angels are personal beings who exist without bodies. And, in support of this belief, reference is made, a. to passages of Scripture which call them "spirits": for example, Heb. 1:14; 1 Kings 22:21; Mark 9:20, 25; Luke 24:39; 1 Sam. 16:14, 16, 23; 18:10; 19:9; Luke 7:21; 8:2; Acts 19:12, 15; 1 Tim. 4:1. b. To passages which represent them as God's attendants and ministers: Luke 1:19; Gen. 32:1, 2; Deut. 33:2; Ps. 68:18; Matt. 24:31; 26:53; Luke 15:10. c. To passages which represent them as superior to the known laws of matter: Acts 12:7; Num. 22:23-27, 32, 33; 1 Chron. 21:14-16, 27. d. To passages which represent them as taking possession of men: Matt. 12:26-29; Luke 4:33, 35, 36, 41, and many others. Taken by themselves, these passages afford very considerable evidence that angels are bodiless.

But against this belief and evidence, the following arguments have been brought:

(a) The words of Christ in Luke 20:36, which are supposed to prove that angels have bodies similar to those of the glorified saints; for the saints after the resurrection are said to be "like angels." Yet the words of Christ, strictly interpreted, only prove that glorified

1858; also articles in Herzog, Smith, Kitto, Fairbairn, McClintock, and Strong; and Theologies, *e. g., Hahn* (G. L.), "Die Theologie des N. T.," p. 259 sq.

saints will not marry, because they cannot die; and they cannot die because they are like angels, being sons of God. They may, then, be different from angels, in that they have immortal bodies, while they are like them in the particulars named by Christ.

(b) The words of Jude 6-8 are supposed to attribute a carnal nature to certain angels, and indeed to have reference to the wickedness described in Gen. 6: 2, 4. It is argued that the expression "sons of God," in the latter passage, signifies angels. *First,* Because the same expression denotes angels in other parts of the Bible; for example, Job 1: 6; 2: 1; 38: 7; Ps. 82: 7; Luke 20: 36. But it is replied that pious men are virtually called "sons of God" in the Old Testament; for example, Ex. 4: 22; Deut. 14: 1; 32: 5; Ps. 73: 15; Hosea 2: 2; and that all Christians are represented as "sons of God" in the New Testament; for example, Gal. 3: 26; 4: 5, 6. *Secondly,* Because the manifest contrast between "sons of God" and "daughters of men" requires us to interpret the former of superhuman beings, — that is, angels. This contrast, however, is sufficiently marked by supposing the former to have been the pious descendants of Seth; while the latter were the ungodly descendants of Cain. "That view of Gen. 6: 1-8 is most probable which understands the sons of God as prominent men resembling the gods. We are not to understand thereby demons, for only beings of the same species can have fruitful sexual intercourse, but demoniacal men who became the instruments of demons."[1] *Thirdly,* Because this passage, thus interpreted, explains the otherwise unintelligible reference in Jude. This may be admitted, and still the inquiry be raised whether it is not better to leave the reference in Jude obscure and doubtful than to suppose

[1] "Old Testament History of Redemption," p. 35, by *Delitzsch* (F.).

evil angels capable of the unnatural offence ascribed to them by the proposed interpretation.[1]

(c) Many passages of Scripture represent angels as appearing to men in visible forms: Gen. 18:1-9; Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10. To this it may be replied, that in order to appear at all, they must assume a form of some kind, and a human form would be more suitable than any other. Besides, they are represented, also, as eating human food; and, if we infer that their corporeal appearance was normal, shall we not be constrained to infer that their eating of flesh, etc., was also normal?

(d) The existence of finite beings who are incorporeal is said to be absurd. Bodies are necessary to bring them under the laws of space. They must have a material *ποῦ στῶ*, and this must be a living body. But who knows this to be true? Our experience may be of little value in showing the possibilities of existence. With the same boldness, some say that an Infinite Being cannot know or will.[2]

On the whole, the weight of evidence in support of the belief that angels are incorporeal beings is greater than that which favors the opposite belief, — "*Adhuc sub judice lis est.*"

(2) The *power* of angels. This must be very great as compared with that of men: Ps. 103:20; 2 Peter 2:11; 2 Thess. 1:7. Both of the words in the first passage refer properly to strength or power, — mighty in power, or strong in might. Both of the terms used to define the superiority of angels in the second passage denote power, in the proper sense of the word. And angels are described, in the third, as "the angels of his might," meaning, those by whom the power of the Lord

[1] See Hofmann, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Knobel, Kalisch; and, on the other hand, Keil, Reinke, Vol. V, Calvin, and a great majority of interpreters.

[2] See Bib. Sac., Oct. 1876, p. 740 sq.

Jesus will be wielded, or, at least, fitly represented, at his appearing.

To these statements, and to others of a similar character found in Scripture, may be added the fact that God is often called "Jehovah of hosts," because the angels, as a great army, do his bidding; and, from the way in which this designation is applied, we naturally infer that the soldiers of the heavenly host are mighty and glorious, answering, in some slight degree, and far better than any earthly beings, to the greatness of God. The following passages are also worthy of notice, as they indicate the might of certain angels, if not of all: Rev. 5:2; 10:1; 18:21; 20:1-3.

Yet the power of angels is strictly finite, and, therefore, as nothing in comparison with that of God. They are never represented as sharing in the work of creation; and they are always described as subject to God or to Christ. See Heb. 1:14; 2:5; Jude 9.

(3) The *knowledge* of angels. a. That this is very great, as compared with that of men in the present life, may be inferred (a) from the language of Christ as preserved in Matt. 24:36; Mark 13:32; for obviously this language is ascensive or climacteric, assuming a greater knowledge on the part of angels than on the part of men. The belief of the Jews in the time of David is probably indicated by the words of the wise woman of Tekoah to David: 2 Sam. 14:17, 20; but we cannot appeal to that belief as certainly correct. (b) From the circumstance that they appear to have been for a long time at home with God: Deut. 33:2; Isa. 6:3; Matt. 18:10; 22:30. We do not, it is true, know the time when the angels were created; but it is generally supposed that their creation preceded that of men, if not of the whole visible universe: Job 38:7. (c) From the devout interest or curiosity which they are said to feel in the work of divine grace: 1 Peter 1:12; Luke 2:13 sq.; Eph. 3:10; 1 Tim. 3:16;

5:21 (cf. Rev. 5:11, 12). (d) from instances of demoniac and satanic intelligence recorded in the gospels: Mark 1:24; 5:1 sq. (cf. Acts 19:15).

b. But it is evident from the same passages that the knowledge of angels is limited, and, in this respect, unlike that of God. Indeed, it is by no means certain that either good or evil angels can know what are the thoughts of any man by direct intuition, though they may be marvellously sagacious in conjecturing human thoughts. Neither Gabriel nor Satan is to be supposed omniscient and omnipresent.

II. *The character of angels.* The word "character" is here used as a synonym for moral character, and in this respect angels may be said to form two perfectly distinct classes. For, —

1. Many of them are *sinless.* This may be inferred (1) from the epithets applied to them by the sacred writers: Acts 10:22; 1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Cor. 11:14; cf. Deut. 33:2; Zech. 14:5. In the second passage referred to, they are called "elect angels"; probably because they hold some such relation to other angels as the "elect" among men do to other men. Ellicott says, "With such passages as 2 Peter 2:4, Jude 6, before us, it seems impossible to doubt that the 'elect angels' are those who kept their *first estate,* and who shall form part of that countless host: Jude 14; Dan. 8:10; that shall attend the Lord's second advent." According to Thayer's Lexicon of the New Testament, "Angels are called 'elect' as those whom God has chosen out from other created beings to be peculiarly associated with him, and his highest ministers in governing the universe." (2) From the place where they dwell: Luke 1:19; 12:8, 9; Matt. 18:10; Mark 12:25; Rev. 5:11. It is impossible to suppose that impure beings would be represented as having their home with God in heaven. (3) From the worship which they are said to pay unto God: Rev. 5:11; 7:11

sq.; Isa. 6:3. (4) From the offices which they are said to perform: Gen. 28:12; Matt. 26:53; Luke 22:43; 16:22; Heb. 1:14; cf. Heb. 13:2.

As to the present character of this class of angels, the teaching of the Bible is sufficiently explicit. But the history of mankind naturally suggests to us many queries in respect to the history of holy angels; for example,

a. Were they ever in a state of probation? Were they once tried, as were our first parents, to see if they would remain obedient to God? An affirmative answer may be given, with some confidence, to this question; both because such a trial seems necessary in itself to the proper training of moral beings under God, and also because certain angels appear to have fallen away from their allegiance to God.

b. Are they now in a state of probation? Probably not; or, at least, in no other sense than a moral being is always under probation; in no other sense than glorified men will be under probation hereafter.

c. Have they always been holy, or have they been recovered from a sinful state? There appears to be no evidence in the Bible, unless it be the use of the word "elect" in 1 Tim. 5:21, that any of the holy angels were ever guilty of sin; and this adjective is not sufficient to justify us in supposing a fall and recovery of good angels.[1]

d. Is their stability in virtue due, in part, to either angelic or human apostacy? It may be. Beholding the ruin that has overtaken other offenders, they may have been forewarned, and, seeing the wonders of redemption, they may have learned to love more than they otherwise would.

e. Is their blessedness due at all to the work of Christ? Certainly, it is; for they take a profound interest in his work and the glory of his kingdom; but it is un-

[1] See Thayer's Lexicon.

safe to infer, from Eph. 1:10 and Col. 1:20, that they have any need of the atonement as a means of redemption. These passages, however, indicate the unity of God's moral government, and the reason why some knowledge of angels is given.

2. Many of them are *sinful.* This may be learned (1) from the *epithets* which are applied to them; for example, Matt. 10:1; Mark 3:11; Luke 9:42; Matt. 12:45; Luke 8:2; Acts 19:12-16. (2) From the place where they are said to dwell; for example, 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6; Luke 8:31; Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:7, 10. (3) From the work which they are said to perform; for example, Job 1:6-9; 2:1 sq.; Zech. 3:1, 2; 1 Sam. 16:14; 18:10; 1 Kings 22:21 sq.; Zech. 13:2; Rev. 12:10; Matt. 13:39; Luke 8:12; John 8:44; 13:2; 1 Tim. 3:7; 2 Tim. 2:26; 1 Peter 5:8; Eph. 6:11, 12; 1 Tim. 4:1.

Several queries are also suggested by the language of Scripture in respect to evil spirits; for example:

a. Are demons, together with Satan, fallen angels? We have assumed this to be the meaning of Scripture, and would refer to the following passages in support of our assumption: 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6. But some have insisted that Satan was never a holy being, appealing to the following passages: John 8:44; 1 John 3:8; Rev. 12:9. It is, however, incorrect to suppose that the phrase, "from the beginning," as used by John, refers to any other beginning than that spoken of in Gen. 1:1. The sinfulness of Satan antedates that of mankind. He has been known to our race in no other character than that of a tempter and seducer. To suppose that he was created morally evil is absurd; and to suppose that he is uncreated is to deny the supremacy of God. The only view consistent with biblical monotheism is that of his early apostacy; and, if he apostatized, so also did his angels, — that is, the demons.

b. Are they all doomed to eternal punishment? The Bible appears to teach this: Matt. 25:41; 2 Peter 2:4; Rev. 20:2, 3, 10; (cf. Eph. 1:10, 21, 22; Col. 1:20; 1 Cor. 15:25). The passages inclosed in parentheses have been thought by some to predict a final restoration of all beings, including fallen angels, to the favor of God; but they do not seem to me to warrant such a view.

c. Has the recovery of their forfeited state ever been possible? The Bible nowhere intimates that it has; while the most natural inference from the language of Peter and Jude is, that it has not. Many modern critics affirm that the language of Peter and Jude can only be reconciled with that of other parts of Scripture, by supposing that some of the apostate angels have been kept in close confinement since their fall, while others have been allowed to roam abroad and tempt mankind. But this view is precarious; and, even if it were correct, it would not prove that any offer of pardon has been made to the unconfined apostates. Besides, the Bible seems to assign the first place in evil to Satan, who is certainly represented, as in some sense, free to wander up and down the earth, tempting mankind. Perhaps Tartarus is not so much a place as a state, and the confinement not so much local as moral and providential.

d. In what did the peculiar enormity of their original sin consist? Any reply to this must be conjectural. It is evident, however, that one, at least, of the angels must have sinned without being tempted thereto by any living being; but it is improbable that this was the case with all. Hence, the enormity of their sin must be sought in something else. Perhaps it was in this, that they had greater knowledge of God than was possessed by Adam and Eve, — a knowledge due either to their longer life before sin, or to their closer relation to God, or to both these circumstances combined.

e. Have we any right to say that their sin was greater

than that of our first parents? Either their sin was greater, or some other circumstance rendered the course which was taken with men less appropriate for them. The government of God is always determined by sufficient reasons. It is holy and wise.

III. *The employment of angels.*

1. Of *good* angels. This is indicated (1) By the *names* which are given to them in the sacred record: in Hebrew, מַלְאָךְ, properly an abstract noun, signifying execution, service, sending, but generally used as a concrete meaning, a. messenger, and b. messenger of God; in Greek, ἄγγελος, signifying also (a) messenger, and (b) messenger of God. It is to be observed that Hebrew names were often significant of the office or character of those to whom they were given. In this case, obviously, the name was derived from the office or employment, — that is, from the employment of this order of beings with reference to men. But it would be a hasty inference should we say that, because they are called angels, their time is mostly given to the work of bearing messages from God to his creatures. In respect to men only can their name justify such an inference. As known by men, they are God's messengers.

The same is proved (2) by the *actions* ascribed to them by the same authority. See 1 Kings 19:5; Matt. 1:20; 2:13, 19; Luke 1:11 sq.; Acts 5:19; 8:26; 12:7; Heb. 1:14; Ps. 91:12; Deut. 33:2; Ps. 68:18; Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2. From these passages we conclude that angels were often employed by Jehovah as his messengers to men, that they took some part in delivering the law on Sinai to Moses, and that they execute the will of God among men whenever he pleases, be that will gracious or retributive.

(3) But it has been asserted with confidence, that particular men or nations or elements are intrusted to the care of particular angels, who are therefore called

"guardian angels": Matt. 18:10; Acts 12:15; Dan. 10:5 sq. 20, 21; 12:1; Rev. 7:1, 2; 14:8; 16:5; 19:17. In Matt. 18:10, it is said of believers in Christ that "their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven"; but this may only signify that the angels who are ministering spirits to Christians dwell in heaven as their home, and are permitted to see God face to face. It does not prove that a particular angel is put in charge of a particular believer; nor does it prove that angels spend most of their time in serving the heirs of salvation.

In Acts 12:15, an expression is used which implies a belief in the doctrine of "guardian angels," and also a belief that each man's angel appeared sometimes in the semblance of the person himself. But we do not know who the speakers were; they may not have been inspired persons; and nowhere else in the Bible is there any trace of this supposed imitation of the form or voice of particular men.[1] Owing to the dramatic and symbolical character of Revelation, it seems to be unsafe to rely upon the representations which it gives of angels as literally exact; and therefore the doctrine of tutelary angels is nowhere taught, unless it be in the book of Daniel.

In Dan. 10:21, a heavenly messenger addressing Daniel uses the expression, "Michael, your prince"; and in 12:1 it is said that "in those days shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people." Here, certainly, a particular angel may be meant, who was charged with the duty of guarding the interests of the chosen people; but whether he did this always, or only at a certain crisis of their history, is not stated. More exactly, it is only stated that he did this at a certain crisis. The doctrine of tutelary angels does not, therefore, seem to be clearly taught in the holy Scriptures.

[1] See Wetstein *ad loc.* and the note of Hackett.

(4) It has been supposed that the holy angels are, in some real sense, an organized community, kingdom, or army: See Luke 2:13; Rev. 12:7; 19:14; 2 Pet. 2:11; 1 Thess. 4:16; Jude 9; cf. Luke 1:19; Rev. 8:2, 6; Rom. 8:38; 1 Pet. 3:22; Eph. 3:10; Col. 2:10, 15; Eph. 1:21; Col. 1:16. Also Eph. 3:15; Heb. 12:22, 23. From these passages it may be inferred, a. that holy angels do not live and act every one by himself, but rather in sublime order and concert. b. That some of them are distinguished for wisdom and strength above their fellows, and are, therefore, under Christ, leaders of the celestial host. c. That these leaders have different degrees of authority, according to their several ability. Hahn classifies them thus: (a) Archangels (especially Michael), or those who stand before God. (b) Primacies, *ἀρχαί*. Thrones, *θρόνοι*, or authorities, *ἐξουσίαι*. Powers, *δυνάμεις*. (c) Lordships, *κυριότητες*. (d) That something analogous to tribal or local divisions may exist among them. Yet this is by no means certain: Eph. 3:15.

(5) It has likewise been supposed that the holy angels are very numerous: Matt. 26:53; Heb. 1:14; 12:22; Rev. 5:11; Dan. 7:9, 10. The word of God, it will be seen, fully justifies the belief referred to. But whether the unfallen angels outnumber the fallen, we cannot tell, though it would be pleasant to suppose that they do.

(6) No religious veneration should be paid to angels: Col. 2:18; Rev. 19:10; 22:8, 9. Neither should they be invoked as advocates of men before the throne of God; for there is one Mediator between God and men; and, besides, angels are not omnipresent.

Remark: The doctrine of angels, and especially of good angels, "renders more clear our conception of the all-surpassing majesty of God, — of the divine greatness of the Lord, and of the glory of his yet future appearing.... It raises man, by reminding him of his exalted

rank and high destiny: Matt. 22:30. It shames the sinner, by asserting to him the possibility of a normal development of spiritual beings, and at the same time by showing to him their interest in the work of his conversion. It directs the Christian to a lofty source of consolation: Ps. 91:11, 12; an excellent example: Matt. 6:10, and a heart-cheering perspective: Hebrews 12:22." [1]

We come now —

2. To the *employment* of *evil* angels, which may be treated briefly, since it is, speaking generally, just the opposite of that to which good angels are devoted. The kind of activity characteristic of evil spirits is indicated, (1) By the *names* given to their chief — namely, adversary, slanderer, and perhaps Apollyon: 1 Chron. 21:1; Matt. 4:1; 9:34; 1 Pet. 5:8; Rev. 9:11; 12:9, 10. His followers are like him, working toward the same end which he seeks. (2) By the *actions* ascribed to him or to them: 1 Chron. 21:1; Job. 1:6 sq.; Luke 8:12; John 13:2; 2 Cor. 11:14; 1 Tim. 3:6; 4:1; 2 Tim. 2:26; 1 Pet. 5:8; Rev. 20:1, 3. (3) By their *taking possession* of men.[1]

We mention the last item separately, because it seems to have been limited to a brief period of time. From the accounts in the New Testament, we conclude a. That evil spirits can so unite themselves to a human being as to control his bodily organs, causing dumbness or blindness: Matt. 9:32; 12:22; Luke 11:14. b. That they can thereby produce or aggravate disease, — as insanity, epilepsy, lunacy, emaciation: Matt. 8:28; 17:15 sq.;

[1] *Oosterzee,* J. J. Van.

[2] See *Farmer* on "Demoniacs"; *Owen,* "Demonology of the New Testament," Bib. Sac., 16:116; "Demoniacal Possessions of the New Testament," Am. Presb. and Theol. Rev., 1865, 495 sq.; *Hovey* on "The Miracles of Christ," ch. 4; *Smith's* Dic. of the Bible, art. "Demon"; *Kitto's* Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., art. "Demon"; *Kitto's* Jour., 4:1; 7:394; Meth. Quart. Review, x:213; "Appleton's Works," 2:94.

Mark 9:18; 5:3 sq.; Luke 8:28, 29; 9:39. c. That their presence was revealed by some peculiarity unknown to us at the present day. d. That their usurped control over the bodily organs of men was not confined to those preëminently wicked: Mark 9:14-28. e. With reference to the demons, their removal was called a "casting-out": Matt. 8:16; 10:1, 8; Mark 1:34, 39; with reference to the demoniacs, a "healing": Matt. 15:28; Luke 6:18; 7:21. f. Some of the Jews claimed to cast out demons: Matt. 12:27.[1] Whether Christ indorsed the correctness of their claim is doubtful. g. Evil angels are spoken of as a kingdom: Matt. 12:26; Mark 3:24; Luke 11:18; Rev. 12:7, with a ruler at their head: Matt. 9:34; 12:24; 25:41; Rev. 12:7, 9; 2 Cor. 12:7. This ruler is called by way of eminence, the wicked one: Matt. 5:37; 6:13; 13:19, 38; John 17:15; 1 John 2:13, 14; 3:12; 5:18, 19; Eph. 6:16; 2 Thess. 3:3; the Satan: Matt. 12:26; the devil: Matt. 13:39; the enemy: Matt. 13:25; the adversary: 1 Tim. 5:14; 1 Pet. 5:8; the accuser of the brethren: Rev. 12:10; the spirit of error: 1 John 4:6; the ruler of this world: John 12:31; 16:11; (cf. 14:30); the god of this world: 2 Cor. 4:4; the old serpent: Rev. 12:9; 20:2; the great dragon: Rev. 12:3, 4 sq.; 13:2, 4.[1] This same prince of the demons is represented as ruling over mankind: 1 John 5:19; John 14:30; 12:31; 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4.

The language of these and other passages of the New Testament is very strong. Satan is even represented as having in some sense the power of death; which, however, cannot mean that he has power to take the lives of men at will, or that he is the one who does put an end to the natural lives of most men: Heb. 2:14. It may be worthy of notice that Satan's subordinates also bear

[1] *Josephus,* Antiq. 8, 2, 5.

[2] "Army of fiends, fit body to fit head" (*Milton,* "Par. Lost," 4:953).

sway over men: Eph. 6: 12. To many minds the idea of such a kingdom is very awful; they prefer to think of evil spirits as acting without concert; but this is not the doctrine of the New Testament. There is order in their madness. Still, their power over men is limited. They can do nothing without man's consent; and their apparent victories lead only to a complete overthrow.

Queries. (*a*) Are demons still permitted to take possession of men as in the time of Christ? We are not aware of any evidence that would justify an affirmative answer to this question.

(*b*) If not, why were they permitted to do it then? Possibly that the lordship of Christ over the invisible world might be signally revealed, even in his humiliation. "The clearest revelation of heaven," says Macmillan, "is the necessary correlative of the clearest revelation of hell." Satan has been called "*Dei Simius*," the ape of God; "He can only sow tares, — an imitation of wheat."

(*c*) Are the rappings, table-movings, etc., of modern times, the direct work of evil spirits? From the best evidence we have, it seems to us more likely that they are of mundane origin.

(*d*) Have evil angels any special connection with pagan deities? 1 Cor. 10: 20, 21; 8: 4. No other connection than they have with all great manifestations of sin in the world. In the last passage Paul says: ὥσπερ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, — thus affirming that in some sense, there *are* "gods many and lords many," and in the first that what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God. Putting these together it may be just to conclude that Paul regarded the idolatries of heathenism as virtually under the control of evil spirits.

(*e*) Will evil spirits resume their former modes of action at any future period? Rev. 20: 8. Possibly, yet with variations adapted to the weakness of man at the time.

PART THIRD

JESUS CHRIST, HIS PERSON AND WORK

PART THIRD

JESUS CHRIST, HIS PERSON AND WORK

The Apostle declares, that "when the fulness of the time" was come, God sent his Son into the world: Gal. 4:4; and by "the fulness of the time" must be understood that which filled up the period that was to elapse, according to the counsel of God, before Christ should be born. But Paul does not state in this place the reason why God had fixed the final term of the ante-Christian period at that point of time.

Yet the circumstances of the time, in many respects, were suited to this supreme event in the history of mankind; for (1) The vast Roman Empire offered a broad and accessible field for the spread of the new religion. (2) The Greek language was widely known, and was the best possible medium for imparting to men the truths of that religion. (3) A deep distrust of the "gods many," which their fathers worshipped, had sunk into the hearts of great multitudes of the pagan world. (4) Acquaintance with Oriental nations had stimulated religious inquiry in the West, and had awakened an expectation of new light from the East. (5) Glimpses of spiritual truth had quickened the minds of some among the philosophers of Greece, and had led them to long for clearer light. (6) The tendency to idol worship and polytheism among the Jews had been conquered. And (7) in many hearts a longing for the promised Messiah had been kindled to a fervent heat. (8) This longing had reached its highest aim and greatest fervor under the preaching of John the Baptist. But the religious

preparation of the people for the true Messiah had been sought by the providence of God during more than a thousand years. By the teaching of prophets and priests, by temple sacrifice and song, by discipline through sore adversity and strange deliverance, and, at last, by synagogue worship and exhortation, the Jews had been finally weaned from idolatry and led to a strict monotheism. The law had done its work, and some of the nation were waiting for the consolation of Israel. What more could be done for the Lord's vineyard than had already been done?

Believing that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah for whose advent the nations had been sufficiently prepared, we have reached in him the central fact of our religion and theme of our study — Jesus the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world. And the first question to be answered is this: Was he a mere man, a simple human being? Or was he divine as well as human, a strictly theanthropic being? Any worthy answer to these questions must be derived from a patient interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. In attempting such an interpretation one may begin with the proofs of his humanity and advance to the proofs of his divinity, or may reverse the process and, beginning with the proofs of his divinity, conclude with the proofs of his humanity. The result ought to be the same in either case. In the following pages the second course has been taken, and considerably more space has been given to the evidence that Jesus was divine than to the evidence that he was human: — not, however, because the one truth is more interesting than the other, but because it is far oftener doubted or denied.

CHAPTER I

I. Person of Jesus Christ

UNDER this head will be considered the evidence that Christ was divine, was human, was unipersonal, and was affected in his divinity and his humanity by the incarnation.

On all these topics differences of belief prevail; and it is therefore desirable to make the examination as thorough and impartial as possible without prolixity.

I. Jesus Christ as Divine[1]

Evidence that Jesus Christ, by virtue of his higher nature, was truly God, may be found. 1. In the language of the Old Testament. (1) In respect to the angel of Jehovah; and (2) in respect to the Messiah to come. 2. In the language of Christ concerning himself, as recorded. (1) In the Synoptical Gospels; (2) In the fourth Gospel, and (3) In the book of Revelation. 3. In the language of the New Testament writers concerning him, as found (1) In the first three gospels, and in the Epistles of James, Jude, and Peter; (2) In the writings of Paul, together with the Epistle to the Hebrews; and

[1] *Liddon* (H. P.), "The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 11th ed., 1885; *Parker* (J.), "Ecce Deus"; *Bushnell* (H.), "The Character of Jesus, Forbidding His Possible Classification with Men"; *Fairbairn* (A. M.), "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," pp. 303 ff.; *Barclay* (S. M.), "The Self-Revealing Jehovah of the Old Testament = the Christ of the New Testament"; *Leathes* (S.), "The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ."

(3) In the writings of John, — Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation.

1. In the Language of the Old Testament. There are two classes of passages in the Old Testament which may be examined in order to ascertain whether they cast any light on the higher nature of Christ. In form, one of them is *historical* and the other *prophetic*. One of them records the appearances of a mysterious being called the Angel of Jehovah, and the other anticipates the reign of a mighty and righteous ruler, sometimes called "the son of God." The question as to the former class is this, Do they refer to a truly Divine Being, or to a created messenger of God? And the question as to the latter is, Do they suggest a truly Divine Being or simply exaggerate the greatness of a human Ruler?

(1) To begin with the former class, the following passages may be referred to: Gen. 16:7, 10, 13; 18:1, 2, 3, 13, 17 f.; (cf. 17:1 f.); 31:11-13; (cf. 28:11, 22); 32:25-31; (cf. Hos. 12:4); 48:15, 16; Ex. 3 *passim;* 23:20-23; (cf. Isa. 42:8); 32:34; 33:3, 14; (cf. 2 Sam. 17:11); Deut. 4:37; Isa. 63:8, 9. Hence "the angel of Jehovah," "the angel of God," "the angel that wrestled with Jacob," that "redeemed Israel from all evil," "the angel in whom is God's name," "the angel of his presence," and "his presence" are appellations of a being who is also called by himself or by the sacred writers "God," "Jehovah," and "I am that I am," or simply "I Am"; it may therefore be inferred that the two sets of designations are in some way equivalent, or at least applicable to the same person.

a. Dr. Goodspeed analyzes the literary phenomena as follows: (a) "He frequently applies to himself the name Elohim and Jehovah, also, 'I am that I am.' (b) He speaks with absolute and independent authority, as if a divine person. (c) He accepts and exacts divine honor and worship, as in sacrifice. (d) Scripture writ-

ers apply to him the divine names, Elohim and Jehovah." [1]

b. It will be observed that the sensible appearance or sign-presence of this being was variable; sometimes it was flame-like, as in the bush and over the camp by night, yet without producing the ordinary effect of flame; sometimes cloud-like, as over the camp by day, yet without having all the properties of a cloud; sometimes like an earthquake or strong wind, sometimes like a still, small voice; and sometimes with the looks and bearing of man, yet appearing and vanishing strangely. The sensible manifestation was scarcely adapted to suggest a definite order of created being. But the office was that of representing God or Jehovah, and in no instance was there any reluctance shown to having worship paid him by men.

c. The fact, however, that he was sent, that he was a messenger from God, is sufficient to prove that he was not revealed to the prophets as God in an absolute sense, though he might well be a representative of God. His work was to some extent that of a mediator between God and his people, and thus identical in quality with that of Jesus Christ, to whom the name angel or apostle is once applied in the New Testament: Heb. 3:1. The corresponding verb is often used in the fourth Gospel with reference to the mission of Christ: John 3:17, 34; 5:36; 6:29, 57; 7:29; 17:3, 8, 21.

d. Moreover, the angel of Jehovah or Jehovah's face seems to be identified with the higher nature of Christ by some of the New Testament writers: for example, 1 Cor. 10:4; (cf. Ex. 23:20, 21; Judges 2:1-5); Luke 1:15-17; (cf. Mal. 3:1-24). According to the Apostle the apparent source of the water furnished to the Israelites was indeed a natural rock, but the real source was Christ. He it was who accompanied them and by his

[1] Bib. Sac., July, 1879.

power made the rocks springs of living water to relieve their thirst.

If we interpret these historical accounts of the Angel of Jehovah in the Old Testament by what John says in the prologue to his Gospel, that the eternal Word was the light of men from the beginning, we shall agree with Justin Martyr and a long succession of Christian teachers that the person so designated was Christ in his higher nature which became flesh and tabernacled among men. This mediating angel prepared the way for his own greater work in the fulness of the time.

(2) There is another class of representations in the Old Testament which are evidently *prophetic,* embracing parts or the whole of such Psalms as the 2d, the 45th, the 72d, the 110th, with a number of paragraphs in the prophetic books. How are such representations to be understood? Can they be direct predictions of the Messiah to come, the imagery being drawn from past or current events or personages, but with no idea of fulfillment by living men? Or must they be typical predictions, spoken with direct reference to characters or events belonging to the times of the writers? The latter view is affirmed with too great confidence by certain leaders in higher criticism. They cannot believe that prophets were called to depict, even in figurative language, events in the remote future. Such predictions would have been useless to their contemporaries as well as psychologically inexplicable.

But are not the principles of righteousness eternal? And do not the descriptions in these predictions emphasize those principles and foretell their realization? Would such ideals be without influence, even if they were not fulfilled before the eyes of the people? Why do men now preach of the resurrection of the dead and of the life to come? Would it not have been useful to a David, a Jehoshaphat, or a Hezekiah, to have the reign of the

ideal king set before him, even though he was conscious of not being himself that ideal king? And would it not have been useful in turn to the people, rendering some of them at least anxious to hasten the coming of the better day? There are men far in advance of their age, having visions of the future. Why may not some of the Hebrew prophets have belonged to this class? Paul says, that we as Christians live by hope; could the most spiritual Israelites have lived in any other way?

Yet there can be no objection to the hypothesis of typical prophecy. And some of the passages cited below may be naturally explained in this way. Especially is it conceivable that a prophet might be moved by the Spirit of God to encourage a youthful king to become an ideally righteous ruler, a true shepherd of his people. His language might have been predictive in form, but hortative and conditional in sense, as so many of the prophecies certainly were. And in that case he would rise to the highest standards both of government and of blessing.

With these suggestions we turn to the passages which appear to foreshadow a divine human Messiah.

a. The second Psalm represents the wicked as conspiring against Jehovah and against his Anointed. This Christ, on the other hand, is set forth as begotten by Jehovah, invested by him as king in Zion with the government of mankind, sure to subdue all his foes, entitled to the homage of all men, however high their rank, and a source of blessing to those who put their trust in him. The New Testament writers apply the words of this Psalm to Jesus Christ. See Acts 4:24, 27; 13:33; Heb. 1:5; 5:5. The internal peculiarities of it require such an application; and the ancient Jews ascribe to it the same Messianic character. Perowne believes that it had primary reference to some Jewish monarch, as Solomon, perhaps; but this monarch was so conceived of and de-

scribed as to be a type of Christ. Such a view of its meaning does not detract from its value as evidence for the Godhead of Jesus.

b. The forty-fifth Psalm celebrates the righteousness, power, glory, and happiness of a righteous King. His reign is to be perpetual. He is addressed as God; and his spouse, the object of his love, is urged to forget her own people and father in her regard for him. In favor of the Messianic interpretation of this Psalm may be urged the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews: see 1 : 8, 9 — which is of itself decisive, — and also the admission of the Psalm into the canon of the Old Testament by the Jews; for, as a royal *epithalamium,* it must be pronounced extravagant and even impious. Only by interpreting it of Christ and his Church (cf. Eph. 5 : 23 sq.) can its right to a place in the canon be vindicated; and we know of no valid objection to this interpretation. Yet we do not assert that it could not have had respect, primarily, to some Jewish monarch, who was made by the Spirit of God a type of Christ to the sacred writer.

c. The seventy-second Psalm represents the Messiah under the figure of a king's son, who is also king, and whose reign is righteous, universal, peaceful, beneficent, and perpetual. Though the Psalm is not expressly quoted in the New Testament, the terms which it employs are so extravagant, if meant for an earthly monarch, and so exactly pertinent to the Messiah, according to other descriptions of his reign in the Old Testament, that every just principle of interpretation requires us to look upon it as relating to him, either typically or directly; and, if so, the seventeenth verse teaches his divinity, — "His name shall be forever; before the sun shall he continue his name; and they shall bless themselves in him: all nations shall pronounce him blessed."

d. The one hundred and tenth Psalm represents the

Messiah as co-regent with Jehovah, — as an eternal priest-king, and as subduing all his foes. The Psalm is very often quoted in the New Testament, and always as descriptive of Christ; and its language is obviously inapplicable to a merely human being. One who is a σύνθρονος with Jehovah, and a regal priest forever, can hardly be less than God. This remarkable Psalm is most naturally understood as a simple and direct prediction of Christ; yet some prefer to regard it as describing typically his reign.

e. The words of Isa. 9:5, 6, seem to pass entirely beyond the limits of any even poetic description of a simply human ruler, and must be interpreted of Christ. Consider them: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace. And to the increase of his government and to peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it in judgment and in righteousness, from this time and to eternity." This language ascribes to the Ruler in question a nature and office truly divine; and it may therefore be relied upon as teaching the deity of Christ.[1]

f. The words of Micah, 5:2-5, may be translated thus: "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, too small to be among the thousands of Judah, from thee for me shall one come forth to be a ruler in Israel; and his comings forth are of old, — the days of eternity," etc. In this

[1] See "Holy Bible, Polychrome Edition," Isaiah, p. 145, l. 17, and Addenda, p. 210. The title "Father of Spoil" (p. 15, 1, 2) seems most infelicitous. But the rendering of the AV, *the everlasting Father,* or *Father of Eternity* (RVM), does not give a perfectly natural sense in this context."

The sense is perfectly natural if the Ruler described is the true Messiah, fortold by either direct or typical prophecy.

remarkable prediction, the Messiah is represented as one —

(a) Whose places of coming forth had been "of old, — the days of eternity";

(b) Whose place of coming forth hereafter should be Bethlehem, — a small village in Judea;

(c) Who should be born of a woman;

(d) Who should be a ruler in Israel; and

(e) Who should rule as a shepherd in the strength and name of Jehovah.

g. The words of Malachi 3: 1, "Behold, I am sending my messenger; and he shall prepare the way before my face: and the Lord whom ye are seeking shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in," etc. The speaker in this prophecy is Jehovah of hosts; the messenger sent before is *his* messenger, preparing *his* way; and the Lord, the messenger of the covenant, in whom the people profess to delight, and who is about to come to his temple, and sit as a refiner and purifier, must certainly be Jehovah himself, but in the person of Christ.

h. Daniel "saw one like a son of man," who "came with the clouds of heaven," even to the Ancient of days. "And there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away," etc.: 7: 13, 14. This vision was manifestly typical of the kingdom and reign of Christ; and, if it represents without exaggeration the greatness and duration of that kingdom, he must be divine; for the true God will not give his glory to another.

2. In the language of Christ himself as recorded (1) *In the Synoptical Gospels.* For according to the plain meaning of his words and conduct, as here represented, he claimed —

a. To have superhuman knowledge, and particularly

a knowledge of future events contingent on the free agency of man: Mark 11:2-6; Luke 19:30-34; Matt. 26:31-35; Mark 14:27-31.

b. To work great miracles, such as raising the dead, and feeding the multitudes with five loaves and two small fishes: Matt. 14:19-21; Mark 6:41-44; Matt. 11:5; 15:30, 31; Luke, 8:41-56; 7:11-17.

c. To empower others to work miracles, or to perform them himself at their word, though he was not with them: Matt. 10:8; Luke 9:1, 2; Mark 6:7, 12, 13.

d. To forgive sins as if with divine authority, implying certainly a knowledge of the heart, and a right to speak as God, or for God: Matt. 9:2-6; Mark 2:5-12; Luke 5:20-26.

e. To rule over all things, — at least, in behalf of his people, — and to be present with them in all their places of worship: Matt. 11:27; Luke 10:22; Matt. 28:18; Matt. 18:20.

f. To know the Father directly and fully, as no one else can: Matt. 11:27; Luke 10:22.

g. To be the Son of God, in a peculiar and eminent sense, implying sameness of Nature: Matt. 10:32, 33; 11:27; 16:17, 27.

h. To be the final Judge: Matt. 7:21-23; 13:41-43; 19:28, 29; 25:31 sq.; Mark 14:62; Luke 9:26; 22:69, 70.

(2) *In the Fourth Gospel.* The language of Christ in this gospel is often remarkable, and sometimes difficult to understand; but it evidently claims for him —

a. To be from above, where he had been with the Father in glory, before the world was: 3:13; 6:38, 50, 51, 62; 17:5.

b. To be, in a distinctive sense, the Son of God, knowing perfectly the way of the Father, and doing always what the Father did: 5:17-27, 36, 43; 6:40; 10:37, 38.

c. To be possessed of divine attributes and prerogatives: 3:13; 8:58; 14:9; 16:15; 17:10.

d. To be the source of light and life to men: 12:35, 36, 45, 46; 11:25; 14:6.

(a) The language preserved in the fifth chapter is certainly very profound. By it Christ represents himself as knowing all that the Father performs, and as doing the same things which the Father does, in the same way in which the Father does them. Nay, more; by it, Christ affirms the impossibility of his doing anything apart from the Father. The two were inseparable in action; and their activity was divine, having its source in the Father's will.

(b) With this language should be connected his declaration in the tenth chapter, showing that his followers could not be wrested from him, because his own power and action were those of the Father as well, — "I and my Father are one";[1] and also his words to Philip and the other disciples, recorded in the fourteenth chapter, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words which I speak to you, I speak not from myself, but the Father abiding in me himself doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me, but if not, on account of the works themselves believe." It was difficult for even the eleven disciples to receive the truth as to the absolute unity of Christ and the Father, — a unity which made every act of Christ an act of the Father also.

(c) It was clearly no part of Christ's object to convince the Jews or his disciples of his own deity, apart

[1] *Bengel, ad loc.* "*Unum,* non solum voluntatis consensu, sed unitate potentiæ, adeoque naturæ, nam omnipotentia est attributum naturale: et sermo est de unitate Patris et Filii.... Per *sumus* refutatur Sabellius: per *unum* Arius."

from the Father. This would have been to convince them that there were two Gods for them to worship; but his object was to show them that he was one with the Father, in such a sense that all his working and teaching were the working and teaching of his Father. He knew that the expression, "the Father," would be understood by all to denote the true God; and therefore, in order to emphasize the fact that his works were truly divine, he ascribed them to the will of the Father, as their first cause; but his own will was in absolute accord with his Father's will. His own wisdom and action were a perfect manifestation of his Father's will and action.

(d) The language of Christ appears, no doubt, to give a certain precedence to the will of the Father; and it is not easy for us to define that precedence, or to determine how much his discussion of the matter was influenced by the state of mind which he saw in his hearers. One thing is certain: he acknowledged the deity of the Father; and, if he was to win their confidence at all, it must be by showing them, not that he was *personally* the Father, but that he recognized and honored the Father, and was one with him in word and deed.

(e) But his sayings went beyond the idea of moral unity, such as might exist between a creature and the Creator, and suggested, on the one hand, the idea of a proper sonship, implying the same kind of nature in him and the Father; and on the other hand, the idea of mutual interpenetration or indwelling, which again deepens into that of identity at the very root of being and power, so that the activity of the one was also the activity of the other. And this last view agrees best with the unity of God, and with the passages in which Christ claims divine attributes, for example, John 3:13; 8:58; 16:15.

Says Olshausen (H.): "In the Father, things are shut up

and hidden which manifest themselves in the Son; therefore, all things which the Son has belong to the Father; but, in the Son, the properties of the father are revealed to men, in order that his name may be celebrated with praise. Life thus lying concealed with the Father in the beginning was manifested to men in the Son; so that when the Father is manifested, the Son is to be seen."[1]

(3) *In the book of Revelation.* The words of this book, which may be regarded as the testimony of Christ himself, show —

a. That he is the Son of God, in a sense which makes him truly divine: Rev. 2: 18.

b. That he is the first and the last and the living; or, in other words, eternal: Rev. 1: 17, 18; 2: 8; 22: 13.

c. That he is the Word of God, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords: Rev. 19: 11-16.

d. That he is worshipped by the heavenly hosts with supreme adoration: Rev. 5: 12-14.

e. That he is associated with God as the source of life and light and joy in the heavenly world: Rev. 21: 22, 23; 22: 1, 3, 5.

3. In the language of the writers of the New Testament concerning him, as found: —

(1) *In the Synoptical Gospels and the Epistles of James, Jude, and Peter.* Without entering into any discussion of the objects specially sought by the several writers of these books, it is perfectly evident that they looked upon Jesus Christ as being —

a. One who knew the thoughts of men, — at least of all those whom he met or taught: Matt. 12: 25; Mark 2: 8; 8: 17.

b. One who was in a peculiar and eminent sense the Son of God: Matt. 16: 16; Luke 1: 32, 35; Matt. 3: 17; 17: 5; Mark 9: 7; 2 Peter 1: 17; 1 Peter 1: 3.

c. One who was the Head and Lord of all Christians,

[1] "Opuscula," quoted by *Fairbairn* on 1 Tim. 6: 19.

worthy of perfect obedience and religious homage: James 1:1; 2:1; Acts 10:36, 42; 1 Peter 1:3; 3:15, 22; 2 Peter 1:1, 8, 11, 14; 2:1, 20; 3:18; Jude 1, 4, 17, 21, 25. It is difficult to believe that they could have looked upon him thus, without holding him to be in nature divine.

(2) *In the writings of Paul, together with the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Of the many statements in relation to the higher nature of Christ in this part of the New Testament, only a few can be mentioned. By some of them, Christ is represented,

a. As being, along with the Father, the original source of grace, mercy, and peace to all believers: Rom. 1:7; 8:9; 15:18, 19, 29; 16:20; 1 Cor. 1:3; 16:23; 2 Cor. 1:2; 13:14; Gal. 1:3; 6:18; Eph. 1:2; 3:19; 6:23, 24.

b. As being the possessor and giver of the Holy Spirit: Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; 2 Cor. 3:17.

c. As having supreme authority in the church, and over all things for the church: 1 Cor. 1:1; 5:4; 7:12; 15:24, 25; 2 Cor. 4:4, 5; 5:20; 10:8; Eph. 1:21, 22; 2:20 sq.; 5:5; Col. 1:18; Heb. 3:3, 6.

d. As the One by whom and for whom all things have been made and are sustained: 1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16, 17; Heb. 1:2, 3, 10.

e. As the final judge of mankind; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Thess. 4:15-17; 2 Thess. 1:6-10; 2 Tim. 4:1, 8.

f. As the true and perfect image of God: Col. 1:15; Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:19.

g. As the own and beloved Son of God: Rom. 1:3, 4, 9; 8:3, 29, 32; 2 Cor. 1:19; 11:31; Gal. 2:20; 4:4; Eph. 4:13; Heb. 1:2, 5, 8; 4:14; 5:8; 6:6; 7:3.

h. As being in the form of God before incarnation, and as being God the Creator and Supreme Mediatorial

King: Phil. 2:6; Rom. 9:5; Heb. 1:8, 10; Col. 2:9; cf. 1 Cor. 2:8, 16; 10:21, 22; 11:27; 2 Cor. 12:8.

i. As being addressed in prayer, and made the object of religious worship: 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Tim. 4:18, 22.

(a) Meyer assigns three reasons for believing that the last clause of Rom. 9:5 cannot refer to Christ, but must be a doxology to God the Father. Briefly, they are these: —

a. Paul nowhere else denominates Christ, God; and therefore he cannot be supposed to give him that name here. It is the name which he always applies to God the Father, who is *naturaliter* divine. But it must be said, in reponse to this, that Paul certainly teaches, that Christ once existed in the "form of God," Phil. 2:6 and that in him dwells "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

Why then might he not call him God once, or a few times, though for distinction's sake he generally gave this name to the Father? Besides, Meyer admits that John calls the higher nature of Christ, God, — once, at least; and he says, but once. The case of Thomas, however, affords a second instance, and perhaps 1 John 5:20 a third.

b. That nowhere in the apostolic writings is there a *doxology* addressed to Christ. He admits, indeed, that the doxology in 2 Tim. 4:18 refers to Christ; but he adds, that this is to be reckoned "with the traces of its post-apostolic composition."

There is, however, no sufficient reason to doubt the Pauline authorship of the Second Epistle to Timothy. Nor is there any good reason for supposing that he would not use similar language here.

c. That the words "over all" could not have been used of Christ as God.

But surely if Christ could be denominated God, he could be described as "God over all"; since no one

would dream that God the Father was embraced in the meaning of the word "all." In another place, Paul asserts that God "gave him to be head over all things to the church."

(b) In favor of the ordinary interpretation, which refers the clause to Christ, may be urged its naturalness in the connection, the position of the adjective "blessed" after the word "God," and the presence of the Greek participle, translated "is." For this participle appears to be superfluous, if the clause is a doxology; while the adjective regularly precedes the noun in a doxology, but follows it, as here, in a description. (Compare Luke 1:68; 2 Cor. 1:3; 1 Peter 1:3; Gen. 14:20; 2 Sam. 22:47; Ps. 18:46; 66:20; 72:19; 119:12; Ezek. 3:12; Dan. 3:28, 33;[1] with Rom. 1:25; 2 Cor. 11:31.) The only apparent exception to this rule is in the Septuagint version of Ps. 68:20, where the order of words in the Hebrew is regular. Meyer conjectures that the Hebrew word for "blessed" was repeated in the manuscript used by the LXX.[2]

(c) The best authorities require the word "who" to be substituted for the word "God," in Tim. 3:16. Whether "the Lord" should take the place of "God," as the original reading, in Paul's address to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20:28, is still doubtful. Neither of these passages, therefore, can be associated with Rom. 9:5, by way of argument. The same may be said, though for other reasons, of Eph. 5:5, and Titus 2:13. It is by no means certain, that the word "God" refers, in either of the passages, to Christ; yet a preponderance of evidence

[1] "Prayer of the Three," in the LXX.

[2] See the International Critical Commentary on Romans by *Sanday* and *Headlam*, p. 233 ff., and Fairbairn (A. M.), "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," p. 312; also Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, 1868, s. 462 ff., and *Abbot* (E.), "Critical Essays," pp. 332-438.

favors the view that it does, especially in the second. For, in respect to the first, it is to be borne in mind, that both "God" and "Christ" are used either with or without the article in the writings of Paul; and in respect to the second, that the words "coming," "appearing," and "revelation" are used exclusively of Christ, — that is, when they refer to his second advent. But it is also to be considered, that it is "the appearing of the glory of the great God," etc., which is spoken of here; and therefore, Matt. 16:27 and Mark 8:38 must be compared.

Yet, even in the expression recorded by these two evangelists, prominence is given to *Christ* as the leading figure; for he is to "come in the glory of his Father, with his angels," or "with the holy angels"; while in other passages he is said to come "in his own glory": Matt. 25:31; 1 Peter 4:13; but if the words "great God," in Titus 2:13, refer to the Father, the leading place at the second advent seems to be assigned to the Father, or to his glory. It seems probable, then, that Christ is here called "the great God." If not, his glory must be conceived of as blended with and of the same nature with that of the Father, though taking here a secondary place.

(3) *In the writings of John.* The beloved disciple appears to have been led by the Spirit of God, in view of errors which had begun to appear in the churches, and also, perhaps, in view of his own spiritual insight and predilection of heart, to set forth with uncommon fulness the doctrine of Christ's theanthropic nature; yet he was led to do this, for the most part, by putting on record the teaching of Christ himself, which has been already examined. His own language, however, will be found to repay careful study, whether it be regarded as merely interpreting that of his Lord, or, also, as adding somewhat to the teaching of the latter.

For he teaches distinctly,

a. The Existence of the Word, or higher nature of Christ, in the beginning; and he uses a word to signify that existence which appears to exclude all thoughts of origin: John 1:1; 1 John 1:1, 2. Observe the use of ἦν in speaking of the Word, while ἐγένετο is used of John the Baptist and of the incarnation: John 1:6, 14; cf. 8:58.

b. The Word, or higher nature of Christ, was *with God* in the beginning, and with him, as the Greek preposition suggests, in the way of rational affection and fellowship, — (see the same passages as above).

c. By the Word, according to the will of the Father, all things were brought into existence: John 1:3.

d. He was also the source of all life not strictly divine, and, through it, of all knowledge of God among men: John 1:4, 5; 1 John 1:2; (cf. John 1:9, 14, 16).

e. The incarnate Word, while on earth, was in most intimate and loving communion with the Father whom he revealed, and whom he was able to reveal, because of that communion: John 1:18, 14.

f. He knew, therefore, the mind of God, and at the same time the hearts of all the men with whom he had to do: John 2:24, 25; 5:6; 6:61, 64; 11:13, 14.

g. He was the only begotten Son of God, if not as to his higher nature in eternity, at least as to his divine-human being and personality in time: John 1:14, 50; 3:16-18, 35, 36; 1 John 1:3; 2:23; 3:23; 4:14, 15; 5:5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20; and

h. By virtue of his higher nature, he was truly God: John 1:1; 20:28; 1 John 5:20; (cf. John 1:18).

A few remarks may be added in explanation of certain passages referred to under h.

(a) The substance of Meyer's note on the last clause of John 1:1, is embraced in the following statements:

First, that θεός (God) must be the *predicate* of the sen-

tence; since, if it were not, this declaration would contradict the preceding one, by identifying God and the Word, who are there distinguished. *Second,* that the predicate *precedes* the subject, because the former is to be emphasized: for the progress of thought, "he was *with* God, and he was (not, perhaps, a person of inferior kind, but) of *divine nature,*" requires the emphasis to fall on the added fact. *Third,* the *omission* of the article before θεός was necessary, for ὁ θεός after the foregoing πρός τον θεόν would have ascribed to the Word identity of *person* with the Father, which would have been inconsistent with the *distinction* of person just expressed; while the noun without the article adds to the assertion of distinction in person, — an assertion of unity in *essence and nature.* Meyer quotes from Luther the pithy remark, that "the last proposition, — *the Word was God,* — is against Arius; the other, — *the Word was with God,* — against Sabellius."

(b) There is also force in Green's remark,

"That a term cannot be fully effective, in virtue of its inherent signification, when encumbered with the article" (p. 47). Thus in Heb. 1:1, "had the words been ἐν τῷ υἱῷ they would merely have called to mind the person already familiarly known under the title of the Son of God, without pointing attention to the inherent meaning of the title" (*ib.* cf. John 4:24). In John 1:1, last clause, "θεός is the predicate, — that is, all that is involved in the notion of θεός is predicated of the Word; namely, the proper nature and attributes of God."[1]

It has been thought by some, that John borrowed the term "Logos," from Philo; but this is scarcely probable: certainly he gave the term a meaning very different from that which it has in the writings of the Alexandrian philosopher. After examining the evidence on this point, De Pressensé uses the following language:

(c) "A judgment may now be formed of the assertion, so lightly thrown out, that Philo is the elder brother of Jesus,

[1] P. 37, *Green's* (T. S.) "Grammar of the New Testament."

and the inspirer of John. For my part, I know no contradictions in the history of human thought more flagrant than those which exist beween the doctrines of these two. The first rests wholly upon the negation of moral evil; the starting-point of the second is the deep and bitter consciousness of sin. Alexandrine theosophy admits no redemption; the Gospel is nothing without this article. Philo proclaims the impossibility of Deity uniting himself directly with the human creature; while the incarnation is the grand theme of St. John. The one sees in the Word only the abstract generalization of divine ideas; the other adores in him 'the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father.' Philo's ultimatum is this: *Deity cannot touch that which is material.* The Fourth Gospel is summed up in this expression of its prologue: *The Word became flesh.* The antithesis is absolute; for that which is with St. John a capital truth would be to the Jew of Alexandria appalling blasphemy. If, then, Christianity must, at all costs, be linked with an antedecent system, this precursor must be sought elsewhere than in the synagogues of Egypt."[1]

(d) John 20:28: "My Lord and my God!" These words were addressed to Christ: hence, they pronounce him God, and teach his deity. But some reject the full sense of this expression, on the ground that Thomas was carried away by his feelings, and made use of extravagant language. We see no evidence of this; yet we hesitate to take the words of Thomas at this time, as by themselves proof of the deity of Christ; for the Holy Spirit had not yet been given, to guide the disciples into all the truth. But his words do not stand by themselves. Christ seems to approve them; and John, whose chief object in writing was to set forth the nature and claims of his Master, records them.

"The unbelief of Thomas," says Leathes, "rose to a height of daring obstinacy, which cannot frequently, if in any case, be equalled. It is plain, not only that he must have had

[1] *De Pressensé* "Jesus Christ, Life, Times and Work," p. 83.

evidence of the very nature that our modern doubters ask for, and such as they cannot have, but also, that every single convert whom Thomas brought to Christ must have believed, upon less evidence than he himself had fixed as the limit on which alone he must believe."

And, on the other hand, his recognition of the very deity of Christ was as remarkable and unqualified as had been his unbelief.

"His soul lifts itself, by a sudden mighty sweep, from the unbelief of hopeless melancholy to that highest word of belief" (Luthardt). "The exclamation of adoration by Thomas: 'My Lord and my God!' in which the faith of the most incredulous of the disciples suddenly takes the most daring flight, and attains the height of its aim, such as is announced in the prologue, brings the narrative to a conclusion. It is thus that the end unites with the starting-point."[1]

(e) 1 John 5:20: "This is the true God, and eternal life." This clause relates to Christ, for these reasons:

a. The pronoun "this" is most naturally referred to Jesus Christ, the nearest antecedent.

b. John is wont to represent Christ, and not the Father, as "the Life," or "the Eternal Life." See John 1:4; 6:48; 11:25; 14:6; and 1 John 1:2; 5:11, 12.

c. The Son is declared in the former part of this verse to be essentially one with the true God, by the assertion, that we are in the true God by being in him.

d. The use of the adjective ἀληθινός before θεός can be no objection to a reference of the clause to Christ; for, if Christ was God at all, he was God in reality, not in appearance merely. And, if he was entitled to the designation "true God," there is no reason why it should not be given him here; if it belonged to him as well as to the Father, this was a very suitable place in which to apply it to him.

[1] *Godet.*

e. But the use of the article makes a difficulty, though not, in our judgment, insuperable. For the object here is to emphasize the fact of the Christian's intimate fellowship with God; since being in Christ was being in God. The thought appears to be this: We are in the true God, by being, as we all know that we are, in his Son, Jesus Christ; for Jesus Christ, as well as the Father, and because he is in essence and nature one with the Father, is the true God and eternal life.

Neither the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Spirit can be said to comprehend all that is God, — the entire Godhead; but if they are one in nature and essence, one at the very root of being, it would seem that each of them must be in nature and in his appropriate action the true God to Christians, — the true God, that is, in distinction from all false gods.

f. Reference is made to John 1 : 18, under h, because there is important manuscript authority for reading *μονογενὴς θεὸς* instead of *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς*. The reading is adopted by Tregelles, and ably defended by Dr. Hort. The four best uncials, ℵBC*L, and 33, a very important cursive manuscript, sustain it. If this reading be correct, the words may be translated: "God, only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, he declared him." But the proposed reading, though so well supported, cannot be relied upon in establishing a doctrine of Christ's person.

In conclusion, it may be remarked, that the undeniable and frequent application of the title *κύριος* with or without the article, to Christ by the apostles, proves that they believed him to be God; for, in the Septuagint, this word often represents the Hebrew name, Jehovah; and, in its religious use in the New Testament, is restricted to God and Christ. In several passages of the Epistles, it is difficult to say whether it means God the father, or Christ Jesus. It was certainly applied to Christ in a

religious sense, and was probably used instead of the term "God," for two reasons: first, because the Word was supposed to have been the Jehovah of the Old Testament theophanies; and, second, because it was desirable to avoid designating the Father and the Son by the same word, unless in rare instances, and for special reasons.

Any statements of Scripture which seem inconsistent with the doctrine that Christ, by virtue of his higher nature, was truly God, may be examined to better advantage after considering the evidence for his humanity, and the effect of the incarnation on the divine Word, than in this place.

II. Jesus Christ as Human[1]

Inasmuch as the humanity of Jesus Christ is admitted at the present day by all those who believe in him at all, the discussion of this topic may be made brief, without denying its great importance. For this reason any survey of Old Testament predictions concerning the Messiah is omitted. But no one can doubt for a moment after reading them that they represent the coming Messiah as human. Our study will therefore be limited to the New Testament.

By this we are taught that Christ, in his lower nature, is truly human, in such passages as the following:

1. *Those in which he is denominated man:* John 8:40; Rom. 5:15; 1 Cor. 15:21; Phil. 2:7, 8; 1 Tim.

[1] *Seeley* (J. R.), "Ecce Homo: Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ"; *Keim* (T.), "History of Jesus of Nazareth"; *Young* (J.), "The Christ of History"; *Vickers* (J.), "The Real Jesus. A Review of His Life, Character and Death from a Jewish Standpoint"; *Merrill* (G. E.), "The Reasonable Christ"; *Renan* (E.), "The Life of Jesus"; *Hughes* (T.), "The Manliness of Christ"; *Thorold* (A. W.), "The Tenderness of Christ"; *Ullmann* (C.), "The Sinlessness of Jesus; an Evidence for Christianity."

2:5; see also Luke 24:19; Acts 17:31; John 1:30, for passages calling Jesus Christ *ἀνήρ*. In the first three of these passages, there is no reason for supposing *ἄνθρωπος* to be employed in a restricted or uncommon sense. In the fourth, Christ is said to have appeared in the likeness of men, and to have been found in form as a man, not because his human nature was only apparent, or at best defective, but because it was not all, or even the chief part of him. He was God as well as man. In the fifth he is denominated man, because he performed the work of mediation in human nature.

2. *Those in which he is called the Son of Man:* Matt. 8:20; 9:6; 26:64; Mark 9:9; Luke 9:22; John 5:27; Acts 7:56. This title is used about eighty times by Christ, once by Stephen, and twice in the Apocalypse. It may be traced back to Dan. 7:13, and characterizes Jesus as the true Messiah; but, in the last analysis, it is probably a descriptive title, derived from the human nature of Christ: Matt. 1:1, 21, 25; 12:23; 21:9; Mark 12:55; Luke 20:41; Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8.

3. *Those in which human properties and susceptibilities are ascribed to him:* Matt. 4:1 sq.; 26:37; Luke 2:52; John 11:33, 35; Heb. 2:17; 4:15; cf. 5:2. Accordingly, Christ possessed the spiritual as well as bodily nature of man. Heb. 2:17 pronounces him to have been, *in all respects,* like his brethren; though a limitation is expressed in 4:15.[1]

4. *Those in which his lower nature is called flesh,* etc.: John 1:14; 1 John 4:2; 2 John 7; Rom. 8:3; Heb. 2:14. The word "flesh," as used in the first four passages, is held by most interpreters to signify *man* or *human nature.* Precisely how much is implied by it in any passage must, however, be learned from the context (cf. Luke 3:6; John 17:2; Acts 2:17; Matt. 24:22;

[1] See *Van Oosterzee* on "The Temptation of Jesus," Am. and Presby. Rev. 169, p. 753 sq.

Rom. 3:20). The terms "blood and flesh," used in Heb. 2:14, signify human nature, regarded, perhaps, as frail and mortal (cf. Gal. 1:16; Eph. 6:12). Thus we find a name strictly applicable to but one factor of Christ's lower nature, chosen to designate the whole of it.

5. *Those which describe his official work, and suggest the fitness, if not necessity, of his being man as well as God.* For, as such, —

(1) He could be truly under the law of God, and honor the same by perfect obedience. This evidently was looked upon as at least a part of his work, and indispensable to the rest: Rom. 5:19; Gal. 4:4.

(2) He could suffer as an expiatory sacrifice; and by his own language it is clear that he must needs suffer in that way: Heb. 9:24-28; 1 Peter 2:24.

(3) He could sympathize with men in weakness and trial. This also is treated by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as if it were an important qualification for his work: Heb. 2:17; 5:7-10.

(4) He could raise men into fellowship with God. This certainly was accomplished in the humanity of his own person, and the same he is to accomplish for all who trust in him. He is the first born among many brethren; and this he could not be, were he not, by virtue of his true humanity their brother.

III. Jesus Christ Unipersonal

The evidence which has been adduced in proof of the deity of Christ, on the one hand, and of his humanity, on the other, must be understood to refer to the two sides of his being, — to the two natures brought together in his person. Yet his being was not bipersonal, but unipersonal; strictly speaking, he had but one consciousness, — but one will.

1. In the early churches, an important controversy

arose on the question, whether Christ had but a single will, or both a human and a divine will. The parties were denominated Monothelites and Diothelites. The controversy was apparently terminated in favor of the second party; but it has been renewed from time to time down to the present day.

2. In A. D. 680, the first Trullan (Constantinople) Council decided that "one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, is to be recognized in two natures, unmixed, unchanged, inseparable, indivisible; the difference of natures by no means being destroyed by the unition, but rather the peculiarity of each nature being saved, and running together into one person and one hypostasis. We also preach, in like manner, according to the teaching of the holy fathers, that there were two natural wills or voluntary faculties in him, and two natural energies, inseparable, unchangeable, indivisible, and unmixed; and that the two natural wills were not opposed (God forbid!) as the impious heretics say, but his human will followed, not resisting or struggling against, but rather being subject to, his divine and omnipotent will."

3. The decision of this council was doubtless correct in pronouncing the two natures in Christ to be unmixed and inseparable, and in saying that they were united in one person and one hypostasis; but it was incorrect in ascribing two wills to the one person. Some have thought that Jesus had a kind of double-consciousness, and have explained his language as representing sometimes the human side of his being and at others the divine side, though always speaking and acting as one being having but one will.

4. Many of the creeds, formed soon after the Great Reformation, distinctly assert the unity of Christ as a person. "Two natures in one and the same person" may be called their motto on this subject; but it must not be inferred from this that they pronounced his con-

sciousness or his will single. It was enough to say that he was truly one person.

In proof of the personal unity of Christ, as explained in the first paragraph of this section, reference may be made, —

(1) *To his conception and birth.* For the simple fact that the human and the divine were brought into union in this way points to a single person as the result. Had the connection been established at the time of Christ's baptism, it would have been naturally regarded as similiar to a possession. The Word might have been given to Jesus, as was the Spirit, without measure; but the union would not have been personal.

(2) *To the use of the pronoun "I," in speaking of himself.* If we may regard the gospels as fairly representing his custom in this respect, he was wont to speak with great uniformity in the first person singular; and the language of sincerity is the language of consciousness. Had the Saviour been conscious of two personal centres, of two *egos* in himself, he would doubtless have revealed that consciousness by a frequent use of the pronoun "we." The few cases in which the first person plural pronoun is used do not invalidate this: John 3:11; 4:22; 9:4; 14:23.

(3) *To his resurrection and visible ascension into heaven.* The Scriptures lead one to suppose, that the union of the human spirit with the Word was not severed by his death on the cross; that he resumed by resurrection the same body which was laid in Joseph's tomb; and that, as the God-man, he ascended into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of power. His resurrection is treated as a type and pledge of the saints' resurrection; hence deity and humanity are united in him forever. All this points to a personal union and oneness.

(4) *To his habit of predicating of himself that which*

depended on his divine nature, and that which depended on his human nature, — the one as freely as the other, — in precisely the same way as an ordinary man predicates of *himself* color and weight, hunger and thirst, as well as will and purpose, reason and affection, memory and hope: Matt. 12:25; 17:27; John 2:25; 3:13; 21:17; 8:58; and Matt. 4:2; 21:18 sq.; Luke 2:52; Mark 13:32; Matt. 26:38; John 11:5, 33, 35; Heb. 2:17.

It may be remarked in this place that, in consequence of the personal unity of his being, whatever Christ did or suffered, by virtue of either of the natures united in him, received character from the other also. This remark will need to be borne in mind, when considering the value of his atoning death.

IV. Each Factor Affected by its Union with the Other[1]

FIRST, AS TO HIS DIVINITY

The subject to be discussed in this section is one of peculiar difficulty; and none but a cautious and reverent treatment of it will be likely to result in good. We propose to notice some of the leading theories that have been promulgated by Christian teachers, before stating the view which is supposed to approach nearest the truth.

1. *Theory of Apollinaris.* This was substantially as follows: In the person of Christ, the divine Word took

[1] *Bruce* (A. B.), "The Humiliation of Christ"; *Gore* (Chas.), "The Incarnation of the Son of God"; and "The Consciousness of Our Lord," in "Dissertations," etc.; *Reubelt* (J. A.), "The Person of Christ; freely translated from the German of *W. F. Gess*"; *Thomasius* (G.), "Christi Person und Werk"; *Godet* (F.), "Commentary on John" (*Clark's* trans.), pp. 362 on 1:14, and pp. 396 ff.; *Fairbairn* (A. M.), "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," pp. 354, 476; also the works of *Shedd, Smith* (H. B.), *Dorner* and others.

the place of a human mind or rational spirit, so that his person comprised a human body, an animal soul or life, and the infallible Word. Three things were thought to be gained by this theory: first, the personal unity of Christ; second, the moral immutability of Christ; and third, the suffering of God in the person of Christ.

But it may be urged against this theory, first, that a mutilation of human nature in Christ cannot be proved necessary, in order to secure unity of person, or stability of moral character in him; and, secondly, that the absence of a genuine human soul in Christ must have rendered him inaccessible to temptation, as well as unchangeable in purpose.

The theory as broached by Apollinaris has no advocates at the present time.

2. *Theory of Nestorius.* This was an attempt to assert the completeness of the human nature, as well as of the divine in Christ. According to Hagenbach, "Nestorius supposed that the divine and the human natures of Christ ought to be distinctly separated, and admitted only a junction (*συνάφεια*) of the one and the other, an indwelling (*ἐνοίκησις*) of the Deity." The union was regarded as ethical, rather than physical.

Objections to this theory may be found in the evidence which has been already presented of the personal oneness of Christ; yet it must be freely admitted, that Nestorius did not mean to deny the Unity of Christ's person.

Theodore, a leader of this school, says, "In respect to the union of divinity and humanity, we recognize one person, just as it is said of husband and wife that they are one"; and such a statement condemns the theory which would lead one to make it.

3. *Theory of Cyril.* This was a reaction against that of Nestorius; and it laid special emphasis on the unity of Christ. The oneness of the natures was said to be physical. All the bodily sufferings of man were felt by

the incarnate Word. But the higher nature of Christ remained omniscient; though, for the sake of acting in congruity with its condition, ignorance of some things was professed. The tendency of this view was to find in Christ a resultant of forces, human and divine; though the divine were so superior as to be in constant danger of absorbing the human. Says Dorner, "We may call the view of Cyril (according to which the human is changed into the divine) the *magical* aspect of the union; and that of Nestorius (according to which the two natures are only joined together) the *mechanical*." There appears to be no tendency to revive the doctrine of Cyril.

4. *Theory of Leo.* This was expressed in the confession adopted by the Council of Chalcedon in A. D. 451. It confesses Jesus Christ to be "perfect in deity, perfect in humanity, truly God and truly man; of reasonable soul and body; of the same substance with the Father as to his divinity; of the same substance with us as to his humanity; in all things like to us, except sin; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, manifested in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means abolished by the union, but rather the property of each, preserved and combined into one person and one hypostasis; not one severed and divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, namely, God Logos, Lord Jesus Christ."

This statement represents the cardinal facts truly; but it does not attempt to show in what the humiliation of the Logos consisted.

5. *Theory of Gess.* This theory, which has found several advocates in modern times, asserts that the eternal Word became human in his personality and experience. To be more specific, it is said, that the Logos became totally *unconscious* in the womb of Mary; that he awoke to consciousness as does a newly-born human soul; that

his knowledge was obtained and increased in the same manner substantially as that of other men; that, during his whole earthly life, his consciousness, knowledge, and power were strictly finite; that his miracles were not wrought by his own might, but by the power of the Father and the Holy Spirit dwelling in him, — in a word, that he *became* human, having all the divine attributes, but in a latent condition, their natural action being suspended, the divine consciousness kept in perfect abeyance, and the Logos exercising his energies within the limits appropriate to mere humanity.

This theory revives that of Apollinaris, by teaching that Christ had no rational soul in addition to the incarnate Word, but differs from it by teaching that the incarnate Word in his actual experience was a human soul. In essence, the Word remained divine; but, in attributes he became human.

(1) In support of this theory, reference is made,

a. To the words of John 1:14; and of Paul, Phil. 2:6, which are said to teach the doctrine of this theory expressly. For, by emphasizing the words, *became flesh* (σὰρξ ἐγένετο), and *emptied himself* (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν), the thought comes out distinctly, that in the act of becoming man, the Word depotentiated himself, or changed the properties of his divine nature into those of human nature.

Yet little stress is to be laid on the literal sense of these two expressions. For the verb employed by John is used by Paul (Gal. 4:4) in the sense "was begotten" or "was born." And the language of John may signify no more than that of Paul. This is rendered more certain by the expression used by John in his First Epistle, 4:2; for, "to come *in* flesh" is scarcely equivalent to coming *as* flesh. Still further, the words of the next clause, "and dwelt (or *tented*, ἐσκήνωσεν) among us," may be supposed to imply a reference to his human

nature, as the tent in which the Word dwelt on earth. On the whole, it does not appear to be safe to infer, from John 1 : 14, that the Word became flesh by changing his own attributes into those of flesh, even if essence and attributes are not inseparable, in such a sense that the essence would be no longer the same if the properties were changed.

Equally uncertain is the meaning assigned to "emptied himself," in Phil. 2 : 7. For if the act referred to be interpreted by the clauses that follow, it consisted in "assuming the form of a servant," in "coming to be (or being born) in likeness of men"; and the word "form" points rather to condition and manifestation than to attributes. If it be urged that the words, "emptied himself," naturally signify that, by an act of his own, he parted with the very forces of his being, — the inner powers of his deity, — it must be considered, on the other hand, that change of "form" naturally signifies the opposite of this. Says Dr. Hackett, "'Taking the form of a servant,' states in what the act expressed by ἐκένωσε consisted; namely, in exchanging the form (or glory) in which he existed as God for that in which he existed as a servant. The difference between μορφή, form, manifestation, and ψυχή, soul or οὐσία, nature, substance, becomes important here; for we can understand how Christ, as the preëxistent Logos, could exchange one mode or manifestation of existence for another, but not how he could divest himself of his original divine nature."

b. To the language used in Acts 1 : 2; John 14 : 10; cf. Matt. 3 : 16; Luke 4 : 1; John 3 : 34. These passages teach, it is said, that the knowledge of Christ was limited, inasmuch as it could receive addition from the Father by the Holy Spirit. But, if it is borne in mind that the human nature of Christ was sanctified at conception by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit, it is natural to

suppose the symbolical descent of the Spirit upon him at his baptism, in the form of a dove, significant of a larger, miraculous working of that Spirit in his human soul.

It has also been thought by some, that all the miraculous action of the Spirit during the ministry of Jesus was confined to his own person, or communicated to others from his person. See John 7:39. As it is the special work of the Spirit to prepare the faculties of the human soul to discern spiritual truth, to receive revelations from God, and to impart them to men, it is reasonable to conclude that he rendered a like service to the human soul of Christ, enabling it to receive all needed truth from his higher nature, — the Word.

c. To the language used in John 5:19, 20, 36, and Acts 2:22; 10:38, which teach, it is said, that Christ's *power* was limited in the same way, and to the same extent, as his knowledge. In reply to this, we remark, that his miracles of power appear to have been wrought by Jesus himself, but not apart from the Father and the Spirit, even as the world was made by the Logos at first, but not apart from the Father and Spirit. It was doubtless Christ's aim, in the passages cited from John, to emphasize the inseparable unity of the Father and himself, and the utter absurdity of the Jewish charge, that he was speaking and acting without God, or apart from God. This he denies the possibility of.

(2) A general objection to this view is, that it supposes no proper union of deity and humanity in the person of Christ. He was God, and he was man: God, by virtue of the deity of his original nature; man, by virtue of the human properties and limitations which that nature took for a time in lieu of the divine. Hence, it is scarcely proper to say, that he was God *and* man, or God *plus* man; for, as a whole, he was God in a certain sense; and, as a whole, he was man in another sense: but he

was neither God nor man, in the full meaning of these words. Another objection to this view is that it affirms a change in the Logos, which seems to be incompatible with his deity, and, if really so, is incredible. It is true, that great caution should be used in reasoning about the nature of God; but we are unable to deny all force to this objection.

6. *Theory of Thomasius.* This differs from the foregoing, by teaching that, along with the depotentiated Word, Christ had a human soul, like that of any other man, sin excepted. Thus his human nature was complete; and the two souls, mysteriously united in one person, advanced *pari passu* in knowledge and grace until the hour of his death on the cross. Nearly the same arguments are adduced in support of this theory and of the preceding; and nearly the same replies must be made to them.

But to these may be added several positive objections to them both. And a. They appear to be inconsistent with the claims of Christ while on earth; for example, with his claim of knowledge: Matt. 11:27; John 5:20; of power: Matt. 11:27; John 5:19, 21; of authority: Matt. 9:26; and of timeless being: John 8:58.

b. They appear to be inconsistent with any resumption of divine attributes by Christ, until his mediatorial work is accomplished; for a resumption of divine attributes must be equivalent to laying aside human attributes, which will not take place before "the end," nor even then: John 5:22, 23, 27; Heb. 2:18; 4:15; Rev. 22:1.

c. They appear to be inconsistent with any proper idea of the relation between essence and attributes. The doctrine of transubstantiation is no more incredible than this view of the humiliation of Christ; for the doctrine of transubstantiation simply asserts, that the essence is changed from the natural to the divine, while the attri-

butes or accidents remain unchanged. Very suitably may such theories be characterized as "magical." It is better to have no theory than to accept one of these.

7. *Theory of Dorner.* This distinguished theologian holds that the incarnation was gradually accomplished. The divine Word at first communicated himself partially to the human nature of Jesus, and then in ever larger measure as that nature became able to receive him.

At the outset, the will of the Logos was directed to the production of a theanthropic or holy nature, which should be called "Son of God"; and thenceforth, united with that nature, he knows and wills every act of it as his own.

The eternal Word did not put himself, by the act of incarnation, into a kind of swoon, from which he at last awoke to a simply finite and human consciousness; but he entered and made his own the life of human nature in Christ, enlarging the sphere of conscious fellowship and oneness *pari passu* with the development of that human nature.[1]

These are some of the theories which have been proposed concerning the incarnation and its effect upon the higher nature of Christ. They are none of them altogether satisfactory; though we are inclined to believe that the view of Dorner is less objectionable than any of the others, unless it be that of Leo.

It may be hazardous to say more; but we are partially satisfied with the following statement: —

8. *The divine Word so entered into personal union with human nature in Jesus Christ, that his theanthropic consciousness and experience embraced the action of both divine and human powers and susceptibilities.*

[1] Compare "System of Christian Doctrine," Eng. transl. III., 196: "The whole fulness and majesty of the Logos could only gradually be assumed, and consequently the Divine-human unity itself was conceived to be still in increase."

If his lower nature was truly human, it was finite, and therefore capable of growth; and the limits of his human intelligence must have been present to the consciousness of Jesus, as well as the perfection of his divine intelligence. What then may have been the law of his action as mediator between God and man?

Possibly this: That both his divine and his human faculties were concerned in whatever he did as the God-man. If so, the action of his higher nature was confined within the limits in which the action of the lower could take part. That, in particular, the human intelligence of Christ apprehended all that he taught; for he taught as a theanthropic being. That the human faculties of Jesus shared the knowledge of the divine, as to all that his Messianic work required at any stage of its earthly progress.

In support of this view may be mentioned the following considerations: —

(1) *It agrees with the prima facie import of many passages of the New Testament*: for example, Matt. 11:27; John 5:17, 19, 20, 21, 26; 8:58; 10:28-30; 14:9. The *first* passage is thus translated by Alford: "All things are delivered unto me by my Father; and none certainly knoweth the Son but the Father; neither doth any fully know the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son is minded to reveal him." The verb ἐπιγινώσκω is, properly translated, to know fully; for in the New Testament the simple verb is made intensive by the preposition. The *second* reads: "My Father worketh until now, and I work," referring to supernatural action, like the cure of the impotent man. The *third* declared the action of the Father and the Son inseparable: "The Son can do nothing of himself, save what he seeth the Father doing; for what things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son in like manner." The *fourth* teaches that "the Father showeth the

Son all things that himself doeth"; and the *fifth,* that the Son gives life as truly as the Father; "for like as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." The *sixth* affirms that, "as the Father hath life in himself, so did he give to the Son also to have life in himself." Says Prof. Gess, an able advocate of theory No. 5, described above, "If this word of Jesus refers to his earthly life no less than to that which preceded and followed it, the Son did possess the life of God while on earth; and all that we have said about the self-exinanition of the Logos in becoming flesh would be overthrown." It seems to us perfectly plain that this word of Jesus does refer to his earthly life, and overthrows the doctrine taught by Gess. The *next* passage, as we have seen, declares the conscious life of Christ to be, in some way, unoriginated and timeless. It is a remarkable declaration, "Before Abraham was I am"; and it seems incompatible with the theory of a merely human consciousness in Christ. There was a divine side to his consciousness, flashing its glorious light on certain truths for the human side, that the God-man might testify directly of his higher life. Equally conclusive are the other texts quoted above.

(2) *It ascribes to Christ a truly theanthropic experience.* It supposes that in him the divine Word, as such, and with all his powers unabridged, entered into conscious, personal union with human nature, — *Totus in suis, totus in nostris.* And in no other imaginable way could a being truly divine have personal experience of human weakness and woe. To drop the divine consciousness and become human, and then to drop the human and become again divine, gives no such experience or fellowship; and this circumstance alone raises the theory before us to an immeasurable height above many of the preceding.

(3) *It offers itself to the mind more readily than any other view.* This might be proved, we think, by an appeal to the history of Christendom; but we are willing to have every one test it, by recalling the action of his own mind on the subject.

To this last theory we look as the best expression yet given to the doctrine of the nature of the union of deity and humanity in the person of Christ. But we do not claim to understand fully the miracle of the incarnation, nor do we suppose that the view accepted by us, as approximately correct, can be applied with perfect ease to all the sayings of Christ and his Apostles. It denies any mutilation of the human, any latency or paralysis of the divine in Jesus Christ. This is a great excellence; and it affirms the unity of his person, which is equally important. Both the denial and the affirmation seem to us scriptural; though single expressions may be cited which seem at first inconsistent with one of them.

SECOND, AS TO HIS HUMANITY

This topic may be treated with more brevity than the preceding; yet it cannot be passed by in silence. For the marvellous perfection of Christ's character and development as man was due beyond question in some measure to the personal union of his human nature with the divine Word, and everything which relates to the genuineness of his humanity is singularly interesting to a large class of thoughtful men at the present time.

It must, indeed, be admitted that religious speculation has tended, of late, to an almost exclusive consideration and assertion of the true humanity of Christ; but this is a reason for, rather than against, giving to it all the prominence which it deserves; and a reason for, rather than against, attempting to show how that humanity was affected by the incarnation.

The following statements are suggested by the language of the sacred writers: —

1. *That the human nature of Jesus, though derived from Mary, was purified from all moral evil, or bias to moral evil, by the Holy Spirit, at the moment of its union with the divine Word.* This appears to be no more than a just inference, from the prediction of the angel Gabriel to Mary, as recorded by Luke 1:35: "The Holy Spirit will come upon thee, and the power of the Most High will overshadow thee; wherefore the holy one that is to be born will be called the Son of God" (Noyes).

But the immaculate conception of Christ does not, in the least, presuppose the immaculate conception of his mother. For, if the nature of Jesus could not be spotless without having a spotless mother, neither could the nature of Mary be spotless without having a spotless mother; and so on, back to Adam. But if it was possible for his mother to have been conceived and born from sinful parents, without any taint of moral evil, then it was certainly possible for Jesus to be conceived and born of Mary, though she was herself sinful, without any taint of moral evil; and, of *his* immaculate conception the words of Gabriel are sufficient proof, especially when taken in connection with the story of his life, and with the ample testimony to his freedom from all personal sin: while, of his mother's immaculate conception, the Scriptures afford no proof whatsoever.

Again, the doctrine of Edward Irving, that the Logos entered into personal union with human nature in its fallen state, having a bias to moral evil, is also to be rejected as unscriptural. Yet three arguments are alleged in support of it; namely,

(1) That it is directly taught by Paul, in Rom. 8:3: "God having sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." If Paul's language were "in sinful flesh," the Irvingite theory would be plainly taught: but that is

not his language; and the words which he does use may very well signify, that "the flesh of Christ was *like* flesh of sin, inasmuch as it was flesh, but *unlike,* inasmuch as it was not affected with sin."

Says De Wette, "σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας is *flesh* (or human nature) *possessed with sin;* the apostle could not then have said *in flesh of sin,* without making Christ *partaker of sin;* nor could he have said merely *in flesh;* for then the bond between the manhood of Jesus and sin would have been wanting. He says, then, *in likeness of flesh of sin;* meaning that he had a nature like sinful human nature, but had not himself a sinful nature."

(2) That it is clearly implied in the susceptibility of Christ to temptation, and especially in his knowing by experience how to succor those who are tempted, — the latter being sinners. The argument is plausible, but not conclusive; for, if it be necessary to have a depraved nature, in order to feel the force of temptation, Adam and the angels must have been created with depraved natures. And, if it be necessary to have been in the moral condition of sinners who are tempted, in order to know how to succor them, Christ must have had not only a sinful nature, but also a habit of sinning, to qualify him for his work; but this no one will assert.

(3) That it is implied in a correct view of the atonement. For human nature in its fallen state was summed up in the humanity of Christ, and in that humanity paid the just penalty for all its sin. But the idea that the human nature of Christ was the whole of human nature, in any other sense than that in which human nature is entire in any other man, is a mere fiction of the imagination. If he bore the penalty of sin at all, it was not the penalty of his own personal sin, or sinfulness, but the penalty due to others for their sins. Bearing the penalty of his own sinfulness would not help them, unless it were to bear, themselves, the penalty of *their*

sinfulness. This is self-evident. If there was anything vicarious in his suffering, it presupposes his holiness rather than his sinfulness.

2. *That the human nature of Jesus was supported by the special presence of the Holy Spirit during his public ministry.* This is proved by several expressions of the sacred record: Matt. 3:16; 4:1; Luke 4:1; John 3:34; Acts 1:2. Just what the relation of the Spirit's work in the soul of Christ may have been to that of his higher nature is unrevealed; but from the office of the Spirit in the economy of salvation, — renewing, sanctifying, and preparing men for the reception of truth, — it may be inferred, with some probability, that the human nature of Christ was moved by the Spirit to desire and seek the very things which the incarnate Word desired and sought, thus contributing to the perfect unity of aim and spirit that distinguished Christ from all other men.

3. *That the human nature of Jesus was helped forward in knowledge and virtue, by light which his divine nature imparted.* This may be inferred from the circumstance that it was the Word, the Revealer of truth, with whom this human nature was in personal union. The same consciousness which felt the needs and trials of his finite soul was illuminated by divine light from the Word. Most surely then would the Logos impart to the human faculties all the light which they needed at any time for intelligent participation in the work to be done, or the suffering to be borne. This may be nearly what Dorner means by a gradual incarnation, or communication of himself to his humanity.

In view of what has now been said of the effect of the incarnation on the divine and human natures of Christ, respectively, such passages as Mark 13:32; Luke 2:52, and several others, do not appear to be altogether inexplicable. In his theanthropic work, both natures in the person of Christ were to participate; and therefore

the possibilities of appropriation by the lower nature furnished a moral limit to the action of the higher. That he should reveal his glorious perfections, on a scale determined by the ability of a holy human soul to appreciate his work, was, therefore, embraced in the incarnation of the divine Word.

Reason for the Incarnation

It is held by a considerable number of modern theologians (*e. g.*, Martensen, Liebner, Dorner), that the Logos would have become incarnate if mankind had never sinned. The circumstances of his becoming man would have been different, but the incarnation itself would have taken place none the less. In support of this opinion, appeal is made, —

1. To the following passages of Scripture: Col. 1 : 15-17; Eph. 1 : 10, 22, 23; 4 : 15, 16; Col. 1 : 18-20; for these passages are supposed to teach that Jesus Christ, the God-man, was intended in the eternal plan of God to be the centre and goal and head of all created things, whether angels or men, and it is considered unreasonable to believe that the fulfillment of this plan was made contingent on the fall of Adam.

But we do not see that it is unreasonable to believe this, if the fall of man was foreknown and embraced in that plan, and we are unable to see how the plan could have been perfect without embracing in it this great moral event and all that was fit to be done in view of this event. Besides, the language of Scripture distinctly teaches that this event was, in its consequences, embraced in that plan: Acts 2 : 23.

2. To the very nature of the case; since it is wellnigh self-evident that God would have done as much for an obedient race as he has done for one that is sinful.

But we do not accept this as a self-evident truth. A

parent may do more for a sick child than for one that is well. And it is admitted that the *death* of Christ would not have been necessary, if men had never sinned. Moreover, it is possible that the incarnation would have been of no real advantage to an unfallen race, and the only reason why it is suitable and so admirable to all rational beings is found in redemption. The greater the evil of sin, the more adequate a reason may it have been for so extraordinary and condescending an act as the incarnation.

In opposition to this view appeal is made,

(1) To the following passages of Scripture: Matt. 20:28; John 3:16, 17; Rom. 8:3; Gal. 4:4, 5; Heb. 2:14-16; 1 Tim. 1:15; 1 John 3:8. These verses seem to prove that the principal if not the only reason for the incarnation was the lost condition of mankind. But they do not disprove the presence of any other reason in the mind of God. Indeed, they are perfectly consistent with the view that human redemption was intended to have a great and beneficent influence on other rational beings. And for evidence that this was the case reference may be made, —

(2) To such passages of Scripture as these: Col. 1:18-20; Eph. 1:10, 21-23; 3:10; Phil. 2:9-11; 1 Pet. 1:12, which clearly teach that the actual manifestation of God in Christ, and its blessed results in the salvation of men, was meant to reveal, with extraordinary distinctness, the divine wisdom and goodness. But this surely does not prove that the incarnation, apart from redemption, would have been wise or necessary. It may only show that the permission of moral evil is not wholly incompatible with divine wisdom. The evil being present, its removal at any cost may have manifested the love of God; but if the evil had not been present, who can say that such humiliation on the part of the Divine Logos would have commended itself to reason or conscience? *Non liquet.*

Nor would it be certain that we could give a different answer, if we should hold with Dr. G. W. Samson that the Logos became an angel before he became a man. For there are sinning angels as well as sinning men, and his taking to himself the nature of angels might have been to redeem them from their lost estate. But the grounds for Dr. Samson's belief seem to be shadowy, or if not shadowy, conjectural; though it is fair to say that he does not seem to see any necessity for a full and careful statement of them.

CHAPTER II

II. Work of Jesus Christ

THE work of Jesus Christ for human salvation may be described comprehensively as *Mediatorial.* He is the one Mediator (μεσίτης) between God and men: 1 Tim. 2:5, and the object of his mediation is the restoration of fellowship between God and men. To accomplish this, three kinds of service were seen to be wise and necessary, commonly described as *prophetic, priestly,* and *kingly.* Chronologically, this is a proper arrangement of the three kinds of service, but logically they should be placed as follows, *sacrificial, prophetic, kingly;* the word "sacrificial" being substituted for the word "priestly," because Christ was sacrifice as well as priest. In other words, his work was fundamentally a work of self-sacrifice; by that he revealed the mind of God, and by that his kingly administration is carried forward. He reigns by the power of truth, and especially by the message of the cross. We therefore begin with his self-sacrifice.

Preliminary Remarks

The word *atonement* primarily signifies *reconciliation*: Rom. 5:11 (καταλλαγή), but it is technically used to signify the chief condition, ground, or cause of reconciliation, viz., Christ's suffering for the salvation of men. It is not, therefore, quite satisfactory. But neither is the word *propitiation* (ἱλασμός or ἱλαστήριον), since it suggests the relation of Christ's death to the mind and attitude of God only. The same objection is applicable to the word *satisfaction.* The word *redemption* is no better,

for, like atonement, it points to a result of Christ's work in the *forgiveness of sins* or *justification.* What we wish to ascertain, if possible, is the reason or purpose of the humiliation and death of Jesus Christ, that is, of his self-sacrifice.

A few definitions will open the way for our summary of Scripture teaching. They are believed to be correct, but are subject to revision.

1. *Moral good* consists of *right voluntary action* or *feeling.*

Moral good is ordinarily, but not necessarily or always, a source of natural good. It may be a source of natural evil, that is, if natural evil is ever a means of moral good. Sympathy with those who are suffering because of their sins may be morally right, if it be sympathy with them as suffering, not as sinning; for self-sacrifice is often a duty.

2. *Natural good* consists of *happiness, satisfaction.*

God esteems voluntary righteousness so highly that he made men capable of it, even at the risk of their choosing to do wrong, and although their choice to do this was foreseen. In like manner God esteems social and brotherly life so highly, that he made men capable of it, though at the risk of suffering on the part of the good from their connection with the bad, and even though he foresaw that none of the race could be truly good, without patiently bearing much natural evil with the bad.

Thus there is some analogy between the suffering of Christ and the disgrace and pain which is borne by good men on account of the bad, and often for their benefit. "Sympathy is said to be the only pain which God can bear," and certainly it is not wrong for men to bear it. Indeed, they are required to bear it. And sympathy or suffering with others is closely allied to suffering instead of others. The same motive may influence one to suffer

in place of another as to suffer with another. If one is right, so is the other.

3. *Moral evil* consists of *wrong voluntary action* or *feeling.*

Moral evil or sin is ordinarily a source of natural evil; indeed, of natural evil answering in degree to the greatness of the sin. Natural evil or suffering may, therefore, as a feature of divine government, be perfectly right. It may be favorable to righteousness, because preventive or repressive of sin. In itself it has no moral quality, but it may have an important relation to right or wrong in moral beings, and may, therefore, be demanded by righteousness.

4. *Natural evil* consists of *pain,* or *loss of happiness.*

Other things being equal, the tendency of natural evil to prevent or repress moral evil will depend on the character and certainty of the natural evil. If beings, at once moral and social, could be made to see that natural evil is a just and inevitable consequence — either to themselves or to their associates — of moral evil or sin, it would be most effective in supporting righteousness; it would impress them most deeply with God's unalterable abhorrence of sinful conduct. But the less the penal consequence, and the more easily it can be set aside, the less will be its value in moral government, — it being always understood that the sacredness and value of moral good is not overestimated in comparison with natural good, and that moral evil is not exaggerated in comparison with natural evil.

Two hypotheses are therefore possible.

(1) That moral evil is treated or may be treated in the same way and with as much favor as moral good. For God is love or good will, pure and simple, and love has no regard to the past conduct of its object, but shows as great or even greater favor to the bad than to the good. Hence it makes no use of natural evil in condemning sin

already committed, but only in preventing future sin. Punishment is strictly reformatory, or reformatory and preventive. It has no retributive function. God is not concerned about the past; he is only interested in the future.

But is it true that past sins are ever wholly past? Do they not continue in their influence on others, unless that influence is counterbalanced by something in God's government? Is not God's moral government eternal? Must not moral evil be discountenanced forever by natural evil? Must not sinners be punished rather than petted? Does not conscience insist on this as right and necessary? Yet the great fact of partnership in natural evil must not be overlooked, nor the possibility that this partnership may open a way for pardon and peace in case of repentance.

(2) That in the government of God, moral evil is always counterbalanced and condemned by natural evil. This is necessary because a being that has become morally evil loves moral evil, but dreads natural evil. Such a being is selfish, self-centred, making personal gratification its supreme end or good. Self is abnormally small, unsocial, unsympathetic, but sensitive and intense to everything that interferes with its own will or desire. Hence it shrinks from natural evil, *i. e.*, from pain or loss, whether mental or physical. Natural evil, is, therefore, in one of its functions, God's fitting and indispensable protest against moral evil, *i. e.*, his punishment of it. God cannot punish sin by sin; for sin is wrong and forbidden by him, though loved by the sinner. If, then, he would discriminate against sin or sinners in the moral world, he must do it by means of natural evil. And this natural evil, or suffering of pain and loss, must be borne either by the sinner or by his associates and friends. He must bear it himself, or know that another has borne it for him.

I. Self-Sacrifice of Christ

If, then, we seek to ascertain the *grounds, reasons,* or *motives* for the *self-sacrifice, the suffering of Christ,* as they are taught, or suggested, by the New Testament, the following groups of passages deserve attention: —

1. *Those which show the* NECESSITY *of Christ's self-sacrifice*: Matt. 16:21; 26:54; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22; 13:33; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44, 46; John 3:14; 9:4; 12:34; 20:9; cf. Acts 2:23; 3:18, 21; 4:10-12; John 12:24, 27, 32, 33; Rom. 8:33, 34; Heb. 2:17; 8:3; 9:16, 22, 23, 26; Rev. 13:8; 5:9. Thus the language of Jesus himself, of Peter, of John, of Paul, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents the suffering and death of Christ as embraced in the eternal purpose and foreknowledge of God, as the procuring cause or ground of human salvation, and as the theme of praise and adoration in the heavenly state.

There can be no serious doubt as to the meaning of such language as is found in the places referred to. The death of Christ must have been for some reason necessary in order to the restoration of fellowship between God and men. It must have had some indispensable relation either to the repentance of men, or to their forgiveness in case of repentance, or to both of these. If not, the words of Christ and those of his Apostles are inexplicable. But it seems very improbable that Christ's death was necessary to make his moral influence strong enough to move men to repentance. There were penitent and believing men before the death of Christ was known to them, though not before it was known to God; and as it was known to God from the beginning, it may have had an important relation to his forgiveness of sins in case of repentance, but it could not have had any moral influence on sinners leading them to repentance. Besides, others have suffered martyrdom, with all possible

tortures, because of their love of God and of truth; why are they not equal to Christ as saviour? Is the heroism of a sick man less noble than the heroism of a well man? Is the fidelity of one who is morally weak less touching than the fidelity of one who is morally strong? Think of the sufferings of Paul through thirty years of heroic toil ending in martyrdom! Why do they not lead men to repentance? Why are not men saved by them as well as by Christ's?

2. *Those which make* GOD'S LOVE TO MEN *the reason for Christ's self-sacrifice*: John 3:16, 17; 1 John 4:9, 11; 1 Cor. 1:3, 4; 2 Cor. 5:18, 19; Matt. 5:44-48; 1 Pet. 1:3-5; Rom. 8:32; cf. Luke 19:10; Matt. 20:28; Gal. 2:20; Phil. 2:5 f.; 2 Cor. 8:9; 1 Tim. 2:4-6; Eph. 1:7; 2:4.

These passages represent God the Father as being moved by his love to men when he sent his Son to save them; and they also represent Jesus Christ as influenced by the same feeling and purpose in his work for their salvation. Love seeks the well being of its objects, and the highest love seeks their highest well being, their best good. In the case of sinful man this must include, *first,* their deliverance from sin, for sin is unnatural and debasing. It destroys fellowship with God and with men, and it brings darkness and discord into the sinner's moral life. *Secondly,* their deliverance from the penalties of sin, *i. e.,* from the loss and pain attached to wrong-doing by the author of our being. *Thirdly,* their restoration to fellowship with God and men.

But evidence that God was moved by love to men to give his only begotten Son for their salvation, does not of itself show *why* this gift was necessary, or *how* it tended to such a result. It may have been necessary (1) because without it men could not be persuaded to repent and believe, or (2) because without it God could not righteously save them in case of repentance, or (3) for

both these reasons. But if the second reason is rejected as absurd, must we not conclude that either no other revelation of himself which God could make would lead men to believe in him, or that some men, at least, can be saved independently of Christ's self-sacrifice, and, hence, that his death was not strictly necessary in order to their salvation; indeed, that it has no connection with their restoration to fellowship with God? If then the passages referred to after 1., are to be allowed their full force, we are not at liberty to reject the second reason mentioned, and to put all the stress and emphasis on the first.

3. *Those which make* GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS *along with his* GRACE, *the reason for Christ's self-sacrifice*: Rom. 3:25, 26; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:10, 13; 1 Tim. 2:5, 6; Heb. 9:14, 15, 28; 1 Peter 2:24; Phil. 3:9.

The *first* passage referred to, Rom. 3:25, 26, is the plainest and most comprehensive. In it Paul declares that Christ suffered death by the will of God for the purpose of exhibiting God's righteousness, and that this exhibition of God's righteousness was called for by his forbearance towards sinners in pre-Christian times, as well as by his now accepting, by an act of free grace, those who believe in Christ, as righteous, or as though they were righteous.

Now, unless this transaction was itself righteous on God's part, it could not have been an exhibition of his righteousness. Was it right, then, for the Supreme Ruler to require a sinless being to suffer for the good of sinners? In answer to this question we may say: —

(1) It is right for the Supreme Ruler to require a sinless being to do whatever it is right for such a being to do. This is self-evident, and surely to suffer in behalf of another is oftentimes right. For the moral heroism which endures without pride the greatest loss or pain for the relief of a fellow being is reckoned almost

divine. If, then, the sacredness of moral order in the universe requires that sin be followed inevitably by loss or pain, but under certain conditions permits good men to bear this natural evil in place of the bad, as the only means of their salvation, we can easily see how the death of Christ illustrated the righteousness of God.

(2) It is right for God to require of sinless beings action which is like his own in moral aim, *i. e.*, action which is directed to the same ends as his own, so that there will be perfect fellowship between them. Hence, if he sustains moral order in the universe for its own sake, and because he wishes men to see and admire it, they may be properly required to reverence and sustain such order, even at the cost of almost any suffering that does not imply sympathy with sin. Now, the suffering of Christ was that of a theanthropic being, of One in whom divinity and humanity were perfectly joined in aim and spirit, and in whom there was no fellowship with sin or moral disorder. Is it incredible that such a being should do his utmost to ratify every feature of God's moral government, including that which attaches natural evil, as a penal consequence, to moral evil? Or that he should prefer to bear the rightly imposed and vindicatory suffering of those to whom he offers release upon condition of true repentance? This view of the case does not diminish the evidence which his suffering gives of love to sinners. It only shows the moral necessity of that suffering, however great and mysterious, but it casts no doubt upon his bearing it in their behalf and for their salvation.

The *second* passage referred to, 2 Cor. 5:21, is also very striking and instructive. It declares that God "made him (viz., Christ) who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might become God's righteousness in him" (*τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ*).

The substance of Prof. Boise's note is this: "*Him who did not know sin* (in his own experience, in his own nature), *he* (*i. e.*, God) *made* (to be) *sin;* the abstract word, as in the next clause, *righteousness;* SIN, just that, and that alone; more emphatic than if he had said, made him *a sacrifice for sin;* or made him *a sinner.*"

The obvious sense of the passage is that, though Christ had no acquaintance with sin in his own heart or life, yet owing to his connection with mankind God treated him as if he were responsible for sin in them; also that he did this in order that they might enter into union with Christ and be accepted as righteous, or as if they were righteous. Surely this teaching is in perfect accord with that in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Consider especially the last clause of Rom. 3 : 26.

Equally in point is the *third* passage referred to: Gal. 3 : 10, 13. "For as many as are of works of law (*i. e.*, as depend on works of law) are under a curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continues not in all the things written in the book of the law, to do them"; and it is assumed that no one has done this. But on the other hand, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; because it is written, Cursed is every one that hangs on a tree." A curse is punishment for breaking the law of God. One who bears such punishment is said to be accursed. "Having become a curse for us" is but a stronger expression for having been subject to punishment for us. And by this, the Apostle affirms, Christ purchased our deliverance from the curse of the law (Κριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου). This surely refers to vicarious penal suffering. The connection, the alliance, between Christ and those for whom he died, was such that he could properly bear the natural evils due to sin for them.

In the *fourth* passage, 1 Tim. 2 : 5, 6, it is said that

there "is one mediator between God and men, a man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, the testimony in its own seasons." The expression "a ransom for all" (*ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*) is particularly clear in respect to the vicarious significance of Christ's voluntary death, and in respect to its relation to all men. See the preceding verses for the meaning of "all."

But if Christ suffered for all men, and any of them refuse to accept his aid, must they not also suffer the just penalty of their sins? Yes, both reason and revelation affirm this. Was not, then, some of the Saviour's suffering useless? In a moral respect, no. It revealed the willingness of God to save all who would consent to be saved in the only possible way, or on the only terms consistent with the holiness of God or the welfare of his intelligent universe. And it may be questioned whether any more suffering was necessary to redeem all men than to redeem any number of men. We cannot speak positively on this matter. The most that we can teach with confidence is that the nobler any being is in the sight of God the more valuable must his service be. The same amount of voluntary suffering must therefore do more for a government which it honors, if the sufferer be high and holy, than if he be mean and sinful.

In the *fifth* passage, Heb. 9:15, 28, there are two points of special interest to our study, one that Christ's death had a redemptive efficacy for transgressors under the first covenant, and the other that his second coming will be "apart from sin," while his first coming was not apart from sin, but closely connected with it, since he "was offered to bear the sins of many." The word rendered "to bear" is *ἀνενεγκεῖν*, while the word *προσήνεγκεν* is used in verse 14 of his offering himself without spot unto God, and *προσενεχθεὶς*, of his being offered, in verse 28. Compare Isa. 53:12; Ez. 4:5; 14:10; 18:19, 20; Lev. 5:1, 17; 17:16; 20:19; 24:15; Num.

5:31; 9:13; 14:34; 30:16; also Num. 14:33; Ez. 23:35.

The *sixth* passage (1 Pet. 2:24) is also interesting when studied with the one in Hebrews: "Who himself bore our sins in his own body on the tree" (*ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αυτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῳ σώματι αύτου ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον*).

On this language Mason, in "Ellicott's Commentary," says: "St. Peter asserts that Christ, in his boundless sympathy with fallen man, in his union with all mankind through the incarnation whereby he became the second Adam, actually took as his own our sins, as well as everything else belonging to us. He was so identified with us, that in the great Psalm of the Messianic sacrifice he calls them, 'my sins,' Ps. 40:14, sinless as he was" (cf. Matt. 8:17).

4. *Those which represent Christ's self-sacrifice for sinners as* PROPITIATORY: 1 John 2:2; 4:10; Rom. 3:25; Heb. 2:17; cf. Luke 18:13. It is unnecessary to reëxamine these texts. But it is well to bear in mind while studying them, that God is spoken of by the sacred writers as greatly displeased with sinners. He pities, but he also blames them. And his displeasure is perfectly consistent with his intense desire for their welfare. Indeed, the greater his love the greater may be his indignation if the object of that love is mean and sinful.

The passages given above appear to mean that Christ's self-sacrifice was called for by God's desire to be gracious to sinners without concealing from them his righteousness, or allowing them to think lightly of their own sins. In other words, his pardon could be offered them only on condition they were brought into hearty fellowship with his entire moral nature and government, with his attitude toward sin as well as toward holiness; and this could not be effected by any less sacrifice than

the death of his Son. By allying himself with mankind and by taking on himself the natural evil which expressed God's view of the desert of sin, Christ made it possible for God to be righteous while he accepted as righteous those who came to be of one mind with Christ and welcomed eternal peace through him. This appears to be the Apostle's idea of propitiation; and it confirms our position that the righteousness as well as the love of God called for the self-sacrifice of the Messiah in behalf of sinners, if any of them were to be saved.

This view may be confirmed by a study of the Mosaic institute of sacrifice, and especially of the word which signifies to make propitiation or atonement. For, according to Heb. 10:1, the Mosaic ritual "had a shadow of the good things to come," though not the things themselves. See Lev. 1:4; 4:4, 20, 26, 31, 35; 5:6, 10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7, 15; 8:14, 15; 16:16, 18, 20, 30, 33; 17:11; 19:22; Ex. 29:36; 30:10; (cf. 1 Sam. 3:14). In that ritual, bloody sacrifices were offered to make propitiation for every sin or trespass of a certain character which had been committed by the nation, the priests, or any one of the people. Other things were accepted as thank-offerings, but not for sin or trespass offerings, unless the guilty party was unable to provide an offering with blood. "Without the shedding of blood there was no remission." God would accept nothing else as a suitable emblem of what his holiness required. Many unevangelical scholars admit that Paul and John and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews believed that Christ's death was vicarious.

Says Orelli: "The idea of vicarious expiation is central to Christianity. It is imaged already in the Old Testament expiatory sacrifice, of course, but inadequately, inasmuch as animal life can be no valid substitute for man's. But the Levitical priest might long continue to lead his sacrificial animal to the altar, before becoming aware that his act was

inadequate, having its justification only in something future, to which it pointed" (p. 39).

5. *Those which represent Christ's self-sacrifice as a* RANSOM *for sinners:* Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45; 1 Tim. 2:6; Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:14; 1 Peter 1:19; Luke 24:21; Rom. 3:24; 8:23; 1 Cor. 1:30; Gal. 3:13; Eph. 1:7, 14; Col. 1:14; Heb. 9:15; 11:35; 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23; 2 Peter 2:1; Rev. 5:9; 14:3, 4.

For the meaning and use of λυτρόω, λύτρον, λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, and ἐξαγοράζω, see the words in Thayer's Lexicon of the New Testament, and 1 Cor. 7:23; Eph. 5:16; Col. 4:5.

Three questions suggest themselves at once, viz., What is represented as the ransom paid? From what are sinners delivered by means of it? and How is it related to their deliverance?

(1) The ransom is spoken of as being Christ's life, his own blood, his precious blood, his death, or himself, as will be seen by consulting Matt. 20:28; Heb. 9:12; Rom. 3:25; Eph. 1:17; Rev. 5:9; cf. 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23. But as the death of Christ on the cross was only the lowest point of his humiliation and the extremity of his passion, it may properly be interpreted as including all his suffering in behalf of sinners. Of course, giving his life means the same as suffering death.

(2) The second question, From what are sinners delivered by this ransom? is not so clearly answered by the language of Scripture. But, in Eph. 1:7 and Col. 1:20, Paul makes redemption through his blood equivalent to the forgiveness of trespasses or sins, while elsewhere he makes forgiveness of sins and justification inseparable, if not identical, and attributes them to God. See Rom. 4:7, 8. It would seem, therefore, that sinners are delivered from divine condemnation or punishment in view of the death of Christ whom they accept as their Saviour. In Gal. 3:13, Christ is said to have redeemed

his followers "from the curse of the law," meaning by this expression, from the punishment of sin, from the doom of those who have broken the divine law. Essentially the same thought is expressed in Heb. 9: 15, which affirms that the deliverance of good men of the Jewish economy from their transgressions was due to the death of Christ. And this must signify their deliverance from the penalty of their transgressions, since the death of Christ could not have been the moral influence which led them to believe in God.

But there are passages which find the effect of Christ's sacrifice in deliverance from other things besides the guilt and punishment of sins, *e. g.*, from "all iniquity": Titus 2: 14; from "a vain course of life": 1 Peter 1: 18; from "the body" regarded as "frail and mortal": Rom. 8: 23; from "the earth": Rev. 14: 3; or from "men": Rev. 14: 4. Yet all these are involved in deliverance from the power and penalty of sin.

(3) Our answer to the third question, How is the self-sacrifice of Christ related to the deliverance of men from natural and moral evil? is one of special importance. In the *first* place, then, we believe in the moral influence of Christ's death on the hearts of sinners. A knowledge of his self-sacrifice for them tends powerfully to lead sinners to repent and trust in the mercy of God. Beholding One, who was himself so like God in character, ready to bear so much pain and reviling for their good, tends to excite in them hope in the mercy of God. In the *second* place, we believe that this hope is likely to become conviction or faith, if they see that Christ suffered for them what they must otherwise have suffered themselves, the fitting penalty of their sins, and that he suffered this that they might be delivered from it and have peace with God. An utterly impartial study of the New Testament will lead to the conclusion that its writers believed in this double relation of Christ's self-

sacrifice, — to the love of God for men, on the one hand, and to his regard for his own righteousness on the other. It expressed them both; it was called for by both; and its moral influence over men is increased by its moral relation to God, by the fact that it was demanded by his righteousness as well as his love.

6. *Those which represent Christ's self-sacrifice as qualifying him to* MAKE INTERCESSION *for men, especially for believers in him*: 1 John 2:2; 5:16; Heb. 7:25, 26, 27; 9:24 with context, vs. 23-28; John 16:23, 24; 14:6; Acts 4:12; cf. John 14:16, 26; 15:26; Acts 2:33; Rom. 8:26, 27. The least which these passages can mean is this, that in granting to men forgiveness of their sins, or any other gracious gift, God takes account of the self-sacrifice of his Son in their behalf. And this seems to be the very core of the gospel as understood by John, by Paul, by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and indeed by Christ himself as reported by John.

Hence there are two directions in which the moral influence of Christ's sacrificial work makes itself felt:

a. On the mind of the Father. See John 16:23, 24; 1 John 2:2; 5:16; Heb. 7:25-27; 9:24. His presence with the Father is a perpetual plea for his people.

b. On the minds of men through the Holy Spirit and the word of truth. See John 16:8-15; Rom. 8:15, 26, 27, 32; 1 Cor. 1:23, 24.

At this point may be considered a very interesting question, viz., Does not the efficacy of *intercessory* prayer rest on the same principle of moral government as the efficacy of vicarious suffering? Does it not assume that, in dealing with one moral being, God may properly take into account the action of other moral beings, associated with that one, and interested in his welfare?

(a) Men are not individuals, wholly separate from

one another, but a race, a society, a family of persons closely united and largely responsible for one another's good. Every one is to a certain extent his brother's keeper. God would have spared Sodom if there had been ten righteous men in the city. And there is no limit to the vicarious service which God may accept from one man for another, provided it is not wrong in itself or an encouragement to sin in others. This service may be one of suffering or of work.

(b) Indeed, we do not see why every moral being in the universe may not be responsible, in proportion to his ability, for the character and happiness of the whole. But this responsibility is specially evident in the case of persons who belong to the same race, inasmuch as they receive the benefits of the race connection. An imperfect society is better than no society, and that it may be the best possible, we see the righteousness of our being required to love our fellow-men as we do ourselves. They are our peers and kinsmen, and such love is not only their due but also for the good of all.

(c) Moreover, assuming that God may rightly deal with us as a family or race, and require us to love and serve each other, we can see the propriety of his accepting the service of one in behalf of another, *i. e.*, of treating us in this respect as a single family or unit, in so far as such treatment does not sanction or encourage wrong-doing on the part of individuals. But forgiveness of sin for Christ's sake does not encourage sin. For no one is forgiven, unless he accepts of Christ as his Saviour and Lord, and this acceptance of Christ involves a germ of new life in the soul, a beginning of trust and loyalty towards God, which, under the fostering hand of grace, will issue in perfect holiness.

So important to a preacher of the gospel is a well considered belief concerning the sacrificial work of Jesus Christ, and so much earnest thought has been given to

this subject by devout scholars, that it seems desirable to review briefly some of the most interesting and suggestive

II. Theories of the Atonement

In mediating between God and men it appears to have been necessary for Christ to be both divine and human; and the Apostles emphasize his incarnation, his suffering, his death, his resurrection, and his intercession both with the Father and, mediately, with men: John 1:13; Phil. 2:5 sq.; 1 John 2:2; Rom. 5:6; Heb. 7:25; John 14:26 (Parakletos). All these are embraced in his mediatorial work, and theories of the Atonement should take account of them all. Yet the sacrificial death of Christ may be used, for the sake of brevity, as implying all the rest.

There are two obvious ways of studying the principal theories as to the reasons for Christ's self-sacrifice in procuring human redemption, viz., the historical and the logical; the word "self-sacrifice" being now used in a comprehensive sense to signify the entire humiliation and suffering of Christ. The latter is preferred as briefer and more appropriate to this department, systematic theology.

Theories of the Atonement may be classified in a general way as follows: —

1. *Theories which affirm that the Atonement made by Christ benefits and saves men by its* MORAL INFLUENCE *on their characters, and by that alone.* This is sometimes called the Moral Influence Theory, though it assumes several different forms. It looks upon God as love and nothing but love, upon sin as its own punishment, and upon men as being saved by becoming good. The work of Christ tends to save men by assuring them of God's love and persuading them to love him.

The views of William Ellery Channing will fairly represent these theories.

"We believe," he says, "that Jesus was sent by the Father to effect a moral or spiritual deliverance of mankind; that is, to rescue men from sin and its consequences, and to bring them to a state of everlasting purity and happiness.... He accomplishes this sublime purpose by a variety of methods: by his instructions respecting God's unity, parental character, and moral government;... by his promises of pardon to the penitent and of divine assistance to those who labor for progress in moral excellence by the light which he has thrown on the path of duty; by his own spotless example; by his threatenings against incorrigible guilt; by his glorious discoveries of immortality; by that signal event, the resurrection, which powerfully bore witness to his divine mission, and brought down to men's senses a future life; by his continual intercession, which obtains for us spiritual blessings; and by his power of raising the dead, judging the world, and conferring the everlasting rewards promised to the faithful."

All *this* is true; but in it there is no recognition of the Saviour's work as necessary in order to the forgiveness of sins. God the Father is supposed to be "originally, essentially, and eternally placable," and a return to righteousness by the sinner the sole and sufficient reason for his pardon. Yet it is noticeable that "the continual intercession of Christ obtains for us spiritual blessings." This must mean that Christ's intervention is a reason why God bestows "spiritual blessings" upon men; and if "spiritual blessings" are bestowed at his request, why not the remission of sins as well? I can see no other principle in the one case than in the other. Intercessory prayer rests on no other principle than this, that God helps one in view of the desire or action of another. He accepts and honors, within certain limits, vicarious service. Wherever society exists under the sway of general laws, vicarious service and sacrifice must be

given a large place — much larger than is commonly supposed.

2. *Theories which affirm, not only the moral influence of the Atonement, but also that it was such a* SUBSTITUTE FOR THE PENALTY OF SIN *as makes it consistent with God's holy character for him to forgive and save all those who trust in Christ.*

Under this class may be put the teaching of Edwards A. Park of Andover, Mass. In his pamphlet, entitled "The Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary" (p. 4), the following language is employed:

"The Son of God took upon himself the office of high priest, and offered his blood as a satisfaction for all men; his sacrificial pains and death were inflicted by his Father, were representative of the penalty which the Father had threatened to men, were substituted by the Father for the actual punishment of believers, were equivalent to that punishment in honoring and vindicating the Father's holiness, distributive justice, and law; were needed, first of all, on God's account and in order that he may forgive the sins of the penitent; and, therefore, the grace of Christ as manifested in his sacrificial pains, is the brightest of all his glories."

In other words, "The principle on which the atonement is the sole ground for God's directly blessing men is this, that it exhibits and honors the holiness, the distributive justice, and the law of God, and so promotes the holiness and happiness of the universe as to satisfy God's general justice in rescuing sinners from unconditional punishment, in adopting measures for persuading them to repent." "The moral worth of Christ's sacrifice was owing, (1) To his theanthropic nature. As the God-man he represented perfectly the mind of God and all that is good in the race of mankind. His life was a revelation of what God is and of what man ought to be. (2) To his voluntary suffering which ended in a dreadful death on the cross. This suffering, resembling as closely as the case permitted, the penalty due to men for their sins, was offered by him and accepted by the Father as a substitute for the punishment that must otherwise have

been inflicted upon sinners — the only condition being, that sinners should repent and believe in Christ. The substitute was adequate, since its influence in support of a holy government is as great as the unconditional punishment of sinners would have been; nay, presumably, far greater." (From class-room notes by two of Dr. Park's pupils.)

It will be observed that this theory rests upon governmental analogies. God is a holy Ruler, and the atonement answers the question, How can he save men from the just punishment of their sins?

3. *Theories which affirm, not only the moral influence of the Atonement, but also that it consisted in* CHRIST'S BEARING THE PENALTY *to which sinners are justly condemned.*

The theory of Dr. Shedd is stated by him in the following extracts, which set forth the principles emphasized by this able theologian:

"The death of incarnate Deity . . . is *expiatory*. As such it is related to the attribute of justice in the Creator and to the faculty of conscience in the creature. It sustains the *same* relation to both. It satisfies that which would be dissatisfied both in God and man if the penalty of sin were merely set aside and abolished by an act of will. It placates an ethical feeling which is manifesting itself in the form of remorse in the conscience of the transgressor, only because it has first existed in the nature of God in the form of a judicial displeasure towards moral evil." "The operation of all the other Divine attributes, love itself not excepted, is *conditioned* and *limited* by justice. For whatever else God may be, or may not be, he must be just. . . . There is ample evidence from natural religion that the Deity is holy and impartial; but it is only from revealed religion that the human mind obtains its warrant for believing in the Divine clemency."

"The mercy of God consists in substituting himself incarnate for his creature for the purpose of atonement. Analyzed to its ultimate elements, God's pity towards the soul of man

is God's satisfying his own eternal attribute of justice for it. It does not consist in outraging his own law, and the guilt-smitten conscience itself, by simply snatching the criminals away from their retributions . . . or in substituting a partial for a complete atonement; but in enduring the full and entire penal infliction by which both are satisfied."

"The primal source of law has no power to abolish penalty any more than to abolish law, but it has full power to *substitute* penalty. In case of the substitution, however, it must be a strict equivalent, and not a fictitious or nominal one. . . . A guilt-smitten conscience is exceedingly timorous, and hence if there be any room for doubting the strict adequacy of the judicial provision that has been made for satisfying the claims of the law, a perfect peace, 'the peace of God,' is impossible! Hence, the doctrine of a plenary satisfaction by an infinite substitute is the only one that ministers to evangelical repose."

The theory of Dr. Shedd is open to criticism at three points: (1) It pronounces justice to be the fundamental attribute of God which conditions and limits the action of all other attributes. This, however, is hardly a self-evident truth. It may be that love is just as fundamental as justice. Besides, the word "justice" is a shade more legal and severe than righteousness. (2) It makes *punishment* the normal and *only* proper correlative of sin. Nothing else can take its place. So much sin, so much suffering, or justice fails. But this again may not be self-evident. Is loss of possible happiness suffering, — that is, conscious suffering? (3) It asserts that a sinless Ruler may, if he please, in certain cases, bear as a substitute the punishment due to his sinful subjects. This may be true, but it is far from evident to all religious thinkers.

4. *Theories which affirm, not only the moral influence of the Atonement, but also that the* WHOLE RACE OF MANKIND IS NATURALLY IN CHRIST, *and was therefore punished in and by his suffering and death.*

Take the *Andover Theory,* represented in "Progressive Orthodoxy," as an example. A few passages may be cited:

"The correct and Scriptural starting-point is the mediation of Christ in its universal character. Christ mediates God to the entire universe.... In and through the Logos, the Word, the second Person of the Trinity, that which is absolute fulness and truth in God is communicated into finite existence.... The created universe and all rational beings are through Christ and in Christ.... Christ cannot be indifferent to the least of his creatures in its pain and weakness, for his universe is not attached to him externally, but *vitally.* He is not a governor set over it, but its life everywhere. He feels its every movement, most of all its spiritual life and spiritual feebleness or disease, and appears in his glorious power even at the remotest point" (pp. 43, 44).

"Christ has an organic relation to the race.... Humanity may thus be thought of as offering something to God of eminent value. When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful.... Thus we can regard him as our substitute, not because he stands apart, not because he is one and the race another, but because he is so intimately identified with us, and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with his" (52, 53).

"God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, makes the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting; and he does this in such a way that God's abhorrence to sin is realized, the majesty of law honored, the sinner and the universe convinced of the righteousness of the divine judgments." "The ethical ends of punishment are more than realized in the pain and death of the Redeemer, through whom man is brought to repentance. His death is a new fact, an astonishing, revealing, persuasive, melting fact, in view of which it would be puerile to exact literal punishment of those who are thereby made sorry for sin and

brought in penitence to God. But it is inseparable from repentance or appropriation. There is thus a limit to the vicarious principle.... To the world before Christ came God was unreconciled, because the world had no knowledge of God in Christ."

"If no man cometh unto the Father but by Christ, we conclude that without him — and almost as certainly we conclude that without the knowledge of him — no man can be brought back to God." "In the atonement, Christ the Son of Man brings all humanity to God. No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself. In the atonement God provided redemption for the world by realizing his holy love in the eyes of all the nations."

III. Conclusion

1. There are elements of truth in every one of the theories epitomized above. They agree in affirming, (1) that the mission and work of Christ, culminating in his death and resurrection, are an expression of God's love to men: John 3:16; 1 John 4:9; (2) that they are an equally clear and decisive expression of Christ's love to God and men: John 4:34; 10:11, 15; and (3) that they furnish the strongest motives to repentance and faith on the part of sinful men: 2 Cor. 5:14; 1 Cor. 1:23. To this extent they all agree with what is plainly taught by Christ and his Apostles.

2. But when they undertake to explain the relation of Christ's work or self-sacrifice to the righteousness of God in forgiving and justifying the ungodly, they are less successful in satisfying human reason, conscience, and feeling. Here or there every one of them seems to be weak or obscure, resting on some doubtful premise or overlooking some important fact. Perhaps it is impossible for finite reason to comprehend the action of infinite reason so completely as to perceive the absolute consistency between holy anger and holy love towards the

same beings at the same instant. But nevertheless, the Scriptures represent God as profoundly displeased with sinners while intensely desirous of their well being.

3. They also teach that in and by the work of Christ both these emotions of the Divine Mind are expressed, illustrated, and satisfied — the one as fully as the other. His displeasure with ungodly men might be truly manifested by their punishment, but it is hard to see how his love to them could be so manifested. It could be exemplified by inflicting punishment, if the punishment could be made to satisfy conscience, to appease remorse, to quiet the feeling of self-condemnation, or to produce genuine repentance. Yet of this there is no evidence.

4. But the humiliation and death of Christ in behalf of sinners are said to reveal, that is, to exemplify, the righteousness as well as the love of God. How then do they exemplify his righteousness? For this is the only point of difficulty. Is righteousness illustrated in any way whatever by requiring or permitting the innocent to suffer for the guilty? At first thought this seems to be impossible; but first thoughts are not always final. The absolutely right and best way of dealing with a race of moral beings is not so easily determined. To know what it is, one must know, at least, just what are their moral capacities, just how intimately connected they are with one another, and just what service they ought to render to the author of their being.

5. The members of a family cannot be dealt with as if each one was alone in the world. The members of a business firm cannot be dealt with precisely as if they were not thus united together. The question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" suggests a great deal more of truth than Cain supposed. It is by no means self-evident that in the best possible treatment of associated moral beings, those who are good must not suffer greatly at times for the relief and benefit of those who are bad,

and ought not to do this voluntarily. Nor is there any self-evident reason why this suffering may not embrace what is justly due to the bad for their sins; at least, everything except remorse for personal sin. Indeed, if true goodness includes love to enemies or the morally bad, it must be right for good men in some instances to suffer natural evil in place of the guilty, even when that evil is a just punishment for sin, provided the guilty are not encouraged in sin by escaping the penalty.

6. And there seems to be no reason for denying that this is true of a divine human being. Such a being may act on the same rule of love and sympathy as any other moral being. He may bear whatever righteousness and love move him to bear in place of sinners, provided it is in the nature of the case possible for him to bear it. If the punishment of sin includes annihilation it would not be possible for him to suffer it. If it includes the feeling of personal guilt for sin, as done by himself, it would be impossible for him to suffer it, except by way of sympathy; that is, by entering into the consciousness of the sinner and feeling what he feels. If that were possible, if he could unite his consciousness for the time with the sinner's so far as remorse is concerned, he would suffer the deepest anguish, he would experience the pain of moral remorse, — a righteous pain.

The following propositions appear to be at once rational and scriptural, approved by conscience and supported by history. In the government of God and therefore in his mind, —

1. Holiness is the supreme good, the highest end sought by the creation of moral beings; that is, of beings in the image of God.

2. Love, supreme towards God and equal towards equals, is a chief element and condition of holiness in created beings.

3. With holiness is associated happiness, the only

other conceivable good for conscious beings. Holiness is moral good, happiness is natural good.

4. With sinfulness, the opposite of holiness, are associated pain and loss, the natural opposites of happiness. This association is not arbitrary but grounded in the Divine holiness.

5. God's estimate of the ill-desert of sin is revealed by the certainty and amount of natural evil which he has connected with it, or by the amount of this evil and the difficulty or impossibility of annulling it.

6. God, who is a God of order, may have made his moral universe to be governed by the rule that sin must be followed inevitably by loss and suffering, either in the person of the sinner or of his associates — this loss and suffering being, in fact, the reaction of God's holiness against sin; a reaction, however, mediated by the nature of moral beings and their relations to one another and to God, in other words, by their social and religious nature and environment.

7. As punishment for sin is a natural evil, a reaction against sin, neutralizing to some extent its attractiveness and power, a realistic declaration and testimony of its utter and inexcusable badness, it may conceivably be borne by holy beings in behalf of sinners with whom they are closely associated. Vicarious suffering of the penal consequences of sin is, therefore, by no means absurd under a government which justly requires us to love our neighbors as ourselves. The only obstacle to this is the fact that all men are sinners.

8. But this obstacle to vicarious suffering did not exist in the person of Jesus Christ. He was human, born of woman, born under law, but he was at the same time holy, knowing nothing of sin in his own action. He could, therefore, bear natural evil, *i. e.,* loss and pain, which are the penal fruits of sin, in place and behalf of others with whom he had associated himself intimately.

9. Jesus Christ was also divine as well as human, and, for this reason, it is impossible for us to limit either the amount or the significance of his self-sacrifice in bearing our sins. But it seems to be self-evident that the greater and more sensitive is the being who suffers, the greater may be his suffering in a given time, and the greater also will be the moral significance or value of a given amount of voluntary suffering.

10. By the holy will of God the Father, Jesus Christ consented to suffer an ignominious death at the hands of sinners: Acts 2:23; John 19:11. In no other way could he so clearly show his steadfast righteousness in human conditions, his absolute loyalty to truth, and his unqualified approval of God's method of government. But in that government, punishment for sin is often, if not always, inflicted by sinners, either on themselves or on others: Mark 9:48; Isa. 10:5-12; Rev. 22:15. The fact that Christ suffered at the hand of sinners is, therefore, no evidence that his suffering was not vicariously penal.

11. This suffering took the place and served the purpose of punishment for human sin. This is the *prima facie* import of much biblical language: Isa. 53:5, 6; John 1:29; Heb. 9:11-15; Rom. 3:25, 26; 1 John 2:2; 4:10; Heb. 2:17; 2 Cor. 5:14, 21; Gal. 3:13; Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45; 1 Tim. 2:6. Note the phraseology: bearing sin, propitiation, vicarious death, ransom. In all these passages and many more, the relation of Christ's death to the righteousness of God and the forgiveness of sins is primary and controlling. They present the ethical ground or purpose of the atonement; its direct relation to God, the supreme Ruler of the Universe.

This view of the propitiatory work of Christ accounts for its relation to those who lived before his advent, and, indeed, to all mankind, a relation which can only be explained in this way, or else by supposing a continuance

of human probation after death: See Rom. 3:25; Heb. 9:15; Gal. 3:16, 17, 28. But this relation of the atonement to God is so far from being inconsistent with its convincing and persuasive relation to men that the two naturally go together. The suffering of Christ was none the less borne for the good of men because it was necessary to the forgiveness of their sins, or was borne for the honor of God in the forgiveness of sins.

12. Hence the whole work of Christ is often traced to the love of God to men. See, especially, John 3:16; 1 John 4:9, 10; Gal. 2:20; John 15:13. Ordinarily, perhaps, this is understood to mean love of men irrespective of their moral character, that is, love of them as sentient beings, desire for their happiness. But it may be love to them as moral and religious beings; it may be desire for their spiritual welfare in communion with himself, for their happiness in the way of right living — a happiness and inward beauty of which he has made them capable, and which is the highest of which they are capable. And if so, his love to men as shown by the gift of his Son is a love of their possible holiness as well as happiness. There is little danger of our overestimating the love of God as revealed in the work of Christ, if we do not restrict it to a simple desire for the happiness of men, in the ordinary sense of the word happiness.

13. The work of Christ, including his humiliation and suffering from first to last, was doubtless intended to affect favorably the moral and religious condition of other orders of beings besides mankind: Eph. 1:10, 20-22; 3:10; Phil. 2:10, 11; Col. 1:16-20. So little is said of the bearing of the incarnation and death of the Son of God on the welfare of moral beings not of our race that we cannot emphasize this point; but the Scriptures call attention to it, and reason justifies a belief that it will hereafter be an occasion of wonder and praise.

14. It must be added that the atonement of Christ

ensures the redemption of those only who trust in him. Union with Christ by faith is a condition of salvation through him. Even those who die in infancy cannot be supposed to be saved by Christ unless they are so renewed as to recognize him as their Saviour in the future life.

IV. Objections to this View of Christ's Self-Sacrifice

Against the doctrine which has now been set forth, and which puts such stress upon the propitiatory death of Christ in its relation to the grace of God, it has been objected.

1. That his own words show that his work was finished before his death: John 17:4; 19:28-30. In reply to this objection, it may be said, that Jesus refers in the language preserved in the former passage to his work in educating the disciples; and that he declares in the words of the latter the last prophecy concerning himself to be fulfilled, and, perhaps, the anguish of death to be past. As he uttered the words, "It is finished," he ceased to withstand by divine power the causes which would bring death, and passed, by the separation of soul and body, into rest. From that moment his relation to dying was passive; his proper *work* was done.

2. That death, the penalty of sin, is chiefly spiritual, being a loss of blessed fellowship with the Most High, together with a sense of his displeasure, aggravated by remorse and despair, and that Christ could not have experienced these. This objection is commonly thought to be insurmountable; but it should not be so considered, for the following reasons: —

(1) It is not biblical, but purely rational. It rests for support on the assumed fact, that remorse can only be felt for one's own sin. But this fact is not a self-evident

truth, nor can it be established by any process of demonstration, for it pertains to the realm of actual life in which there are mysteries and seeming contradictions unknown to the realm of pure thought. What elements of remorse are penal?

(2) Beings who have a like spiritual nature can realize and bear the spiritual sufferings of one another. And "bearing another's woe" is sympathy or compassion, when either of these words is used in its deepest sense; it is suffering *with* another, — enduring what his spirit endures, sharing, not his bodily ill, but the feeling which that ill excites; not his sin and guilt, but the spiritual state, the remorse and fear consequent upon them. Owing to the imperfection of their knowledge and love, the sympathy of men with one another is only partial, and not at all commensurate with that of Christ. For —

(3) Christ's human nature was virtually perfect in knowledge and love. It had not, to be sure, all knowledge; but it had at every moment all the knowledge requisite to the complete performance of its work for that moment. And, for practical ends, this was as good as omniscience. His love, too, was equal to his knowledge; so that all the conditions for absolute sympathy met in his person. When, therefore, we read of his agony of soul in the garden and on the cross, culminating in the feeling expressed by the cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" it is not difficult to believe that he experienced the bitterness of remorse and the horror of being deserted of God.

Without professing to have set forth *the* way, and the only way, in which Christ actually bore the penalty due to men for their sins, — without asserting that Christ bore just the amount of suffering which awaited sinners, unredeemed, in eternity, and without overlooking the dignity of his person, which gave inestimable value to his death, we think *a* way has been indicated by which

he could have borne penal woe; and if so, however different in some of its elements may have been the actual suffering of soul endured by him from that which we have suggested, the objection to our doctrine has been sufficiently met.

The following words of Dr. Bruce deserve to be quoted in this place:

"Looking, then, into the Scriptures with unbiased mind, in order to find out the elements of value in our Lord's atoning work, as estimated by the wisdom of the omniscient Spirit, we observe that emphasis is laid on at least four things: *first,* the *dignity* of the sufferer; *second,* his *obedience* to his Father's will; *third,* his *love* to sinners; and *fourth,* his *sufferings* themselves." "The value of Christ's sacrifice was equal to his divine dignity, multiplied by his perfect obedience, multiplied by his infinite love, multiplied by suffering in body and soul carried to the uttermost limit of what a sinless being could experience."

V. The Self-Sacrifice of Christ made for all Men

1. This proposition is rejected by many Calvinists who assert the doctrine of a limited atonement. But they do this against the obvious meaning of Scripture. The language of Christ weeping over Jerusalem is convincing proof that he offered salvation to multitudes who rejected it: Matt. 23:37. See also John 3:16, 17; 1 John 2:2; Heb. 2:9; 2 Pet. 2:1. It would be easy to increase the number of such testimonies.

2. This proposition does not conflict with the doctrine of God's eternal purpose and foreknowledge. God does many and great things for those who persist in rebellion against his authority. He is the Saviour of all men, but especially of those who believe.

3. God removes every insuperable objective barrier to salvation in the case of those who reject it. This fact

accounts for Christ's words of lamentation over Jerusalem, and for his great command to make disciples of all the nations. It accounts also for Paul's language in respect to the knowledge and guilt of the heathen in the first part of his epistle to the Romans.

4. Hence the self-sacrifice of Christ has some relation to the future life of those who die in infancy. We believe they are saved, but not without the help of Christ. He has come into the world and suffered, that he might be the second Adam, the spiritual Head of renewed humanity; and it is not too much to believe that he renews the hearts of our little ones as they pass through the gates of death into the life beyond. If, as we judge, this is the best sort of a world for moral probation, it is reasonable to hold that God will not remove our children from it without preparing them to see Christ in peace when they enter Paradise.[1]

[1] Literature: *Crawford* (T. J.), "The Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement"; *Bushnell* (H.), "Vicarious Sacrifice," etc., as Modified by "Forgiveness and Law"; *Dale* (R. W.), "The Atonement"; *Hodge* (A. A.), "The Atonement"; *Park* (E. A.), "The Atonement" — "Discourses by Edwards, Smalley, Maxey, Emmons, Griffin, Burge and Weeks"; *Miley* (J.), "The Atonement in Christ"; *Symington* (W.), "The Atonement and Intercession of Christ"; *Edwards* (L.), "The Doctrine of the Atonement." Translated from the Welsh by Rev. D. C. Edwards.

PART FOURTH

CHRISTIAN LIFE, ITS BEGINNING AND GROWTH

PART FOURTH

CHRISTIAN LIFE, ITS BEGINNING AND GROWTH

By Christian life is meant a life that is morally right and good, a life which is animated by love to God and man, which is pre-disposed to all holy service, and which delights in communion with the Father of lights. It is, in other words, a manner of living both inwardly and outwardly which fulfills the purpose of man's spiritual nature, being holy instead of sinful, subject to the law of God instead of subject to the law of self; — it is a life of cordial service to God as revealed in Jesus Christ, but mediated directly by the Holy Spirit.[1] It will then be proper for us to study.

[1] Literature on the Spirit and his work: *Buchanan* (Ja.), "On the Office and Work of the Holy Spirit"; *Owen* (J.), "Pneumatologia"; *Hare* (J. C.), "The Mission of the Comforter"; *Parker* (J.), "The Paraclete"; *Smeaton* (G.), "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit"; *Augustine* (St.), "De Trinitate Dei"; and the sections on the Holy Spirit in the Systems of Theology.

See discussion under section III., p. 294 ff.

CHAPTER I

The Beginning of Christian Life

I. Relation of the Father to its Beginning may be seen in the Doctrine of

1. ELECTION

1. In studying the purpose of God, the Scriptures were found to represent that purpose as embracing all the events of time. But no attempt was made to distinguish between the different phases of that purpose. Nothing was said, *e. g.*, in respect to the bearing of purpose on election, or of election on purpose, in the counsels of God. This subject, however, fills so large a place in the writings of the New Testament, that it must not be passed without serious consideration. That it has been an occasion of great perplexity and sharp controversy, is perhaps an additional reason why it should be reëxamined with care.

2. The apostle Paul speaks in Rom. 9:11 of "the purpose of God according to election," and thus teaches that God's purpose to bless Jacob was in accord with his choice of Jacob to be heir of the promise to Abraham. The choice of Jacob insured him a different place in the purpose and plan of God than was assigned to Esau. In certain cases, therefore, God's choice of individuals or of peoples has much to do with his purpose and action towards them. His treatment of them is affected by the office and work for which he has chosen them. And, according to the Scriptures, certain men are chosen by

the Most High for certain privileges, opportunities, services, responsibilities.

3. This fact has already been discussed in speaking of a written revelation. God has been pleased to employ certain men as his messengers to other men, moving them, not only to announce his will orally, but also to put it in writing. He could not employ them to do such service without choosing them for it. This was their election, an election to honor, to service, to responsibility before God, but it was also, many times, an election to trial, reproach, and suffering at the hands of man.

4. The children of Israel were chosen by the Most High to be his people and servants in a special sense and for a particular work, that of receiving and preserving his truth for themselves and for the world. This was their election. This insured them, while obedient, the land of Canaan as their home. But it was an election to service as well as to privilege and primacy in religious affairs. They were put between great nations, though but a handful themselves, and without the highest faith in God and heroic courage before men they were sure in the end to be scattered as chaff before the wind.[1]

5. The Apostles were chosen to be the honored pupils and friends of Christ, that they might be heralds of his gospel to Jews and Gentiles. This was their election to privilege, to honor, to service, to death, and to glory, if they should prove faithful to the end. In the case of Judas it was followed by selfishness, by captiousness, by treachery, and by infamy. An election to privilege and opportunity is not always an election to salvation.

6. But there are passages which appear to teach that God chooses men to be saved from sin and death, without being moved to this choice by any foreseen merit or self-qualification in the persons chosen: James 2:5; 1:18; Eph. 1:4, 5, 9, 11; 2 Tim. 1:9; Rom. 8:28, 30; 9:11,

[1] Cf. *Bruce,* "Apologetics," pp. 204, 207.

24; Acts 13:48; 1 Pet. 1:1-3. According to the most obvious interpretation of these passages, the mind of God and his grace take the initiative in beginning the new life, as we shall see that they do in every feature of its growth afterwards. It is also clear that this initiative by way of choice is not taken because of any moral worth or desert in those chosen. None of the passages mention such a reason for the choice, and if we understand the teaching of Paul as to the natural man, he is neither subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be.

7. Yet there must be good and sufficient reasons in the mind of God for his choice of one rather than of another, though very few, if any, of those reasons have been revealed. One of them is possibly suggested by 1 Tim. 1:13, where Paul confesses that he "was formerly a blasphemer and a persecutor, and insolent," but adds, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly, in unbelief." According to the natural implications of this language, the Apostle supposed that, if he had persecuted Christians with better knowledge and a belief that Jesus was the Christ, the mercy of God would not have been extended to him. His sin would have been like the sin against the Holy Spirit, which cannot be forgiven. And, of course, if such a sinner could not be forgiven, he could not have been chosen to be saved. For though the choice of God is eternal, it is made with a perfect knowledge of every man's life and character.

8. Another possible reason for the choice of one man rather than another, is the fitness which he has to render important service as a follower of Christ. This is possibly implied in the assertion of Paul respecting himself. Gal. 1:15: "When God, who set me apart from my mother's womb, was pleased to reveal his Son in me, that I should make known the glad news of him among the Gentiles, straightway I did not confer with flesh and blood." (Cf. Acts 9:15.) If God was moved to seek,

by extraordinary means, the conversion of Paul, because of the beneficent work that he would do, he was influenced by the same reason in choosing him from eternity to be a subject of his grace and a herald of his gospel. And if this was true in the case of so eminent a Christian as Paul, who is able to say that it is not true of every believer, namely, that he is chosen, not for his own sake merely, but also because of his relations to other men? For it is God's plan to employ men who have known his grace as agents in persuading others to accept it. Only infinite knowledge could do this wisely, but it would be easy for infinite knowledge to do it.

9. We may be overbold in suggestions, but it seems possible that God takes into account the prayers of his people in choosing the subjects of his renewing grace. He has wisely decided to work by means of human sympathies, knowledge, and effort, as well as through the direct influence of his Spirit on the hearts of men; and therefore he condescends to be a co-worker with them, according to the laws and impulses of the spiritual nature which he has given them. Hence, special outpourings of the spirit in answer to prayer within the circles best known to the supplicants! Hence, revivals in the hearts of Christians and conversions in their families and among the people where they dwell! And all this according to the foreknowledge and purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will! In "the Republic of God," human and divine natures are wondrously intimate and complex. All things work together, yet not by way of compulsion.

10. The method of progress in the inanimate and lower animal ranges of existence, by natural selection, is perhaps typical of the method of grace revealed in the Scriptures and in the history of religion. It appears to be the best if not the only method by which the training of a race of moral beings can be effected in great part

through their own agency, with the least possible limitation of their freedom from without, and with the greatest possible recognition of their worth and service in coöperation with God. Left entirely to themselves, they would all continue in sin; lifted indiscriminately by immediate divine influence to the heights of spiritual knowledge and love, the whole benefit of race connection, of discipline, of Godlike self-sacrifice for the eternal good of others, would be lost. They might be like angels, but they could not be ideal men, a family of brothers, interdependent and mutually helpful. They could not have the sphere which they now have for the development of a great and tried character, purified by voluntary self-denial, and made beautiful by suffering for others.

Calvinism, reduced to its lowest terms, may then be said to teach, that all persons who truly believe in Christ were chosen from eternity to be called by the influence and justified by the authority of God himself, not on account of any foreseen conduct of theirs, either before or in the act of conversion, which would be spiritually better than that of others influenced by the same grace, but on account of their foreseen greater usefulness in manifesting the glory of God to moral beings and of their foreseen non-commission of the sin against the Holy Spirit. By the glory of God is meant his true character, especially his desire for the highest good of men as moral beings. Election is therefore implied in God's purpose to work through men for the salvation of mankind, and the wisdom of it depends on his perfect foreknowledge of all the powers and conditions of individual men in relation to others in every age of the world.

Objection

But against the doctrine of election it has been urged that it is inconsistent with the fact that God is "no

respecter of persons." This statement, however, rests on a misunderstanding of the expression, "no respecter of persons," which means, not that God makes all men just alike, or bestows upon them precisely similar or equivalent gifts, but that, in dealing with men as a judge, he always deals impartially, estimating character and conduct by one and the same holy standard, and making all due allowance for their different circumstances in measuring the guilt of men: Deut. 10:17; 1 Sam. 16:7; Job 34:19; 2 Chron. 19:7; Acts 10:34, 35; Rom. 2:11; Gal. 2:6; Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25; 1 Pet. 1:17; cf. Matt. 22:16; Mark 12:14; Luke 20:21; James 2:1; Jude 16. Says Dr. Bliss (on Luke 20:21), "To 'accept the person of anyone' was the same as to 'respect persons,' a Hebrew expression for 'to pervert justice in favor of any one,' to show partiality in pronouncing judgment." And Dr. A. N. Arnold remarks that God "deals with his creatures according to his good pleasure, giving to some much greater favors than to others; but he shows no capricious partiality, always in his final judgment holding an even balance between responsibilities and privileges, without regard to merely factitious distinctions." Sweeping inferences from such an expression as the one under notice are at least rash.

The relation of the FATHER to the BEGINNING of Christian Life may be seen in the Doctrine of

II. PROVIDENCE

1. There is a close connection between providence and election. If what has been said is correct, God's choice of his people must have been determined in part by the world's condition at the time when they should mingle in its affairs and help to shape its course. If their election was to introduce modifying forces into the currents of human thought and life, the providence of

God may well be supposed to have prepared the world for the new spiritual forces to be introduced in pursuance of election. The two forms of divine action are interdependent, meeting at a thousand points and coöperating towards the same end.

2. Beyond question, the course of events in nature and society has much to do with the early training and character of men. It is not without influence at the time of their conversion, and it has an important bearing on their growth in grace to the end of life. Take the case of heathen nations at the present hour. Who can hesitate to believe that, in a certain sense, God's eternal choice of men in China and Japan to be saved through Christ must be connected with his eternal purpose fulfilled in providence by all the appliances of modern life, — by steamships, by commerce, by international law, by learning, by larger views of truth and duty, and by a network of conditions too fine and far-reaching for description, but facilitating in a surprising manner intercourse between Christendom and the outside world?

3. Thus it appears that God's providential government of the nations has a bearing on the salvation of men through Christ. But it reaches individuals in many other ways. How earnestly does Jesus appeal to the Father's care of all! To the fact that he causes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends his rain on the just and on the unjust! It is your heavenly Father who does this, he says. All nature is beautiful with his smile. The birds of the air and the flowers of the field testify of his care. Even sickness and sorrow come to us on errands of mercy. The utter weakness occasioned by disease has a message of love from the wise Father to stout-hearted and self-sufficient transgressors. And the delicious restfulness of convalescence whispers sweetly of his goodness to one who has been tossed with pain. In the parable of the Lost Son who had wasted his portion

with harlots, and came at last to be a keeper of swine, coveting in vain their miserable fare, we may see the hand of providence bringing him to the crisis when he came to himself. Who can doubt the close relation between providence and the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion?

II. Relation of Jesus Christ to the Beginning of Christian Life

1. *As Revealer of divine holiness and love, especially through his self-sacrifice.*

(1) According to the prologue of John's gospel, the preëxistent Word was the source of life for the world; and that life originated by him was the light of men. From the beginning, therefore, the Word has been the revealer. By creating man in the image of God, he made the very nature of man a means of knowledge in respect to the Most High, so that man could not use his own powers and study his own constitution without being reminded of him who is "the First Fair and the First Good." And by surrounding him with numberless beings, inferior to himself, but of wonderful instincts and organs, he gave to him still further light concerning the eternal power and Godhead of his Maker. Every form of life was a ray of light from the divine Word; and, had man continued holy, there is little reason to suppose that he would have needed any better revelation of God.

(2) But sin entered; and the light became darkness, for the eye of the soul was closed. Man read neither the lessons of his own constitution, nor those written on the face of "animated nature." In his self-will he turned the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped the creature more than the Creator. Yet the Revealer did not utterly forsake the world of mankind. There were some to whom he made himself known in a miraculous way. He

appeared to holy men in dreams and visions; he caused them to hear his voice and proclaim to others his will. He was the Angel of Jehovah who spoke from the burning bush. He led his people by the hand of Moses to the foot of Sinai, and gave them the Law. This work of the Logos was continued through the whole Mosaic period, down to the time of Christ; the last and greatest messenger of the Word being John the Baptist, who came for a witness that he might bear witness of the true light: John 1:7.

(3) Then the Word became flesh; and the Apostle testifies, "We beheld his glory, — the glory as of an only begotten from (*παρά*) the Father, full of grace and truth": John 1:14. He was himself a bright revelation of the Father. His spirit, his teaching, his working, were in absolute harmony with the Father's will. He was in the Father, and the Father in him. Every miracle, every parable, every rebuke, every invitation, was full of divine power, holiness, and love.

But the revelation of God made by him reached its highest point in his sacrificial death. By this more vividly than by any thing else in the days of his flesh was made manifest the very "heart of Christ"; and the heart of Christ was also that of God.

(4) After his ascension into heaven, the Saviour continued his teaching by means of his disciples, and especially by the inspired ministry of the Apostles. These repeated and put on record his sayings, described his wonderful works, recounted the story of his crucifixion, and bore witness to his resurrection. More than all, they expounded the meaning of his death as sacrificial, propitiatory, vicarious; and, indeed, as necessary, in order that God might be just, and the justifier of him that trusts in Christ: Rom. 3:26. By this work of the Saviour, continued down the ages through the written word and the testimony of Christians, the moral power or manward

efficacy of the atonement is realized. Thus the preaching of Christ and him crucified, is found to be the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

(5) As an exhibition of the divine character, the self-sacrifice of Christ tends to beget sorrow for sin and trust in the Redeemer. As a practical demonstration of Jehovah's love, paying homage to righteousness, and yet reaching out its hand to recover the lost, it makes the strongest imaginable appeal to man's religious nature. For, plainly, a love which meets the claims of divine justice, as well as the needs of sinful humanity, must be more powerful, as a motive, than a love which has nothing to do with the former while accomplishing the latter. Whatever emphasizes the holiness and justice of God — his sense of what is due to the sinner as a fit penalty for his sins — emphasizes at the same time his love in providing a way of escape from that penalty.

In proof of the moral power of the Saviour's death, we appeal: —

a. *To the contrast between the effect of preaching before and after that death.* The signal effect of the gospel on the day of Pentecost, and subsequently, though due in part to a wonderful outpouring of the Spirit, was also due in a great measure to the saving truth which was now preached with unprecedented clearness.

b. *To the description given by Paul of the gospel which he preached:* 1 Cor. 1 : 23, 24; 2 : 2; 2 Cor. 5 : 20, 21; Gal. 3 : 1. It is certain, from such passages as these, that the preaching of Paul had, for its principal theme, not the holy life, but the sacrificial death of Christ. He relied upon this as most likely to reach the conscience and the heart, whether of the unbeliever or of the believer.

c. *To the account which the Apostles give of the influence of Christ's dying love on their own hearts:* 2 Cor.

5:15; Gal. 2:20; 1 John 4:19; cf. 1 Cor. 1:23, 24; 2:2; 2 Cor. 5:20. The language of these passages is remarkably simple, yet forcible: "For the love of Christ constraineth us, since we thus judged that if one died for all, then all died; and he died for all, that the living might no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again." "I am crucified with Christ; and I live no longer myself, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by faith which is on the Son of God who loved me, and gave himself for me." "We love him, because he first loved us."

d. *To the history of the Christian religion in every land where it has prevailed.* It needs but a slight acquaintance with that history to know how much depends on preaching Christ and his cross, — how little real piety there is if the latter is neglected, and how poorly missionaries succeed who say little of the atonement.

It is worthy of consideration, that the moral power of the self-sacrifice of Christ is due to the union of deity and humanity in his person. Had Jesus been only a perfect man, he might have shown very clearly how much God would wish a subject of his moral government to do or suffer for the benefit of others, but not how much the Supreme Ruler himself would be pleased to do or suffer for such an end. Yet it is this which the heart of man longs to know; it is the latter, and not the former, which will touch the deepest chords of his spiritual nature. See Rom. 8:32; John 14:9.

2. *As Ruler of the Divine Kingdom.*

(1) The Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ is now acting as mediatorial King, subduing the world to himself: Ps. 2; 45; 72; 110; Acts 2:33; Heb. 1:3, 4; 8:1; Isa. 9:6, 7; Luke 1:32, 33; John 8:36; 10:27, 28; 18:36; Rom. 14:9; Eph. 1:22, 23; 5:23; 6:5-9; Phil. 3:20, 21; Col. 1:18; Heb. 3:6; 1 Pet. 3:22.

(2) They teach that he imparts to believers their spiritual life: John 14:6; 6:35; 15:1, 4; Rom. 12:5; 6:11; 1 Cor. 12:27; 2 Cor. 4:10, 11; 5:17; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 2:10; 4:15, 16; 5:29, 31; Col. 3:3; 1 Cor. 12:12; Gal. 3:10, especially *through the gift of the Holy Spirit:* John 14:16; 15:26; 16:7-15; Acts 2:33; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19; 1 Pet. 1:11. Thus the work of the Holy Spirit for the salvation of men is, in a very important sense, the work of Christ, and in studying the work of the Spirit we are continuing our study of the redemptive work of the Son of God.

(3) They teach that he is their patron or advocate with the Father: Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:25; 9:24; 1 John 2:1.

(4) They teach that he is to be the final judge of all men: See Matt. 16:27; 25:31-46; Acts 10:41, 42; 17:31; Rom. 14:10; 2 Cor. 5:10-15.

III. Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Beginning of Christian Life

1. *Deity of the Holy Spirit.*

It is self-evident that we cannot appreciate the greatness of Christ's work through the Holy Spirit unless we first consider the divinity and personality of the Spirit.

As the deity of the Holy Spirit is not often denied at the present time, it seems unnecessary to examine very fully the evidence for it. It will be sufficient to refer to certain passages of Scripture: —

(1) Which ascribe to him divine attributes or actions: Acts 28:25 (cf. Isa. 6:8 sq.); Heb. 10:15 (cf. Jer. 31:33; and 10:1); 1 Cor. 2:10, 11; John 3:5, 6; (cf. 1:13).

(2) Which associate him in religious acts with the Father and the Son: Matt. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:13; 1 Peter 1:2.

(3) Which call him God, either directly, or by implica-

tion: Acts 5:3, 4; 1 Cor. 3:16, 17; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph 2:22; 1 Cor. 6:19.

2. *Personality of the Holy Spirit.*

It will be found, upon examination, that the amount of evidence for the personality of the Holy Spirit is much less than that for the divinity of Christ. But it is to be borne in mind, that, if the deity of Christ and his personal distinction from the Father be admitted, the whole mystery of personal distinctions in the one God is admitted. *Triunity* is no more incredible than *biunity;* and, the latter being proved, there is no logical or philosophical objection to the former.

In proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, reference may be made, —

(1) *To the language of Christ.* According to Matt. 28:19, the risen Saviour commanded his disciples to baptize those who should believe in him unto "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And, as the Father and the Son are certainly conceived of as personally distinct, the Spirit must also be personally distinct from both; for it would be very unnatural to associate an operation or influence with persons, in such a formula.

Again, in his discourse to his disciples, before he reached the garden of Gethsemane, he promised to send them Another Helper, or Advocate, namely, the Holy Spirit; and by calling him "Another Helper," he at once distinguished him from, and associated him with himself: John 14:16; 15:26; 16:7-15.

Besides this, he designated him several times by the masculine pronoun "he," ἐκεῖνος, thus persisting in the personal characterization. It is also true that he used the neuter pronoun "it," in speaking of him; but this is doubtless due to the circumstance that the word signifying "Spirit" is neuter in the Greek language: John 16:7, 8, 13; and 15:26.

The Lord also declared that the coming Paraclete would "not speak from himself"; which certainly implies that he could do so, or was conceived of as able to do so. Says Meyer, "This is the denial of *something conceivable;* and it serves to represent fully the harmony of the Spirit's teaching with that of the Lord." If the Holy Spirit was understood to be a divine energy, or influence, or mode of action, the Apostles could hardly have needed this declaration. Independent action would have been quite out of the question. But, if he was to come as a person, the remark was pertinent, and important: John 5:19.

Still further, Christ assured his disciples that the Spirit would be "sent" by the Father, and by himself; that he would "come" from the Father and "abide" with them; that he would "speak" what he "hears," and "announce" what he "receives"; that he would "teach" the disciples all things, and "guide" them into all the truth; that he would "bring to their remembrance" the Saviour's words, and "reveal to them things to come." If this be mere personification, it is very bold and persistent and unusual personification!

In estimating the weight of these expressions, it must be remembered, that they are taken from a discourse which was eminently solemn, deliberate, and even doctrinal. John may be called the ontological evangelist; and the words of Christ preserved in his gospel are full of truth concerning the being of God.

(2) *To the language of the New Testament writers.* For by their language he is associated with the Father and the Son: 2 Cor. 13:13; Matt. 3:16, 17; Eph. 2:22; 1 Peter 1:2; Rev. 1:4, 5; 5:6 (cf. Zech. ch. 4); 1 Cor. 12:4-6; is represented as willing and feeling: Rom. 15:30; 1 Cor. 12:11; Eph. 4:30; and is spoken of as if he were a personal agent: 1 Cor. 12:8-11; Acts 7:51; 13:2, 4; 28:25; Eph. 1:14; cf. Phil. 3:3;

Acts 21:11; 1 Tim. 4:1; Rev. 14:13; 2:7; 3:6 and often.

These passages, in themselves wholly ambiguous, ascribe choice, feeling, will, to the Holy Spirit. According to one of them, extraordinary gifts were bestowed by him, and at his pleasure; according to another, he can be grieved by worthless speech on the part of believers; and, according to a third, he can be provoked to anger by their rebellion.

Hence, the Holy Spirit cannot be simply a power or energy emanating from God the Father; for such an energy has no will of its own, but is directed by him who puts it forth.

We conclude, therefore, from these texts, that there is a personal distinction between the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Objections Answered

But against this conclusion it has been urged, —

(1) That God the Father is declared to be the efficient cause of all extraordinary powers and works for example, 1 Cor. 12:6.

Reply. We think the essential unity of the Godhead a sufficient reason for this. The one infinite Being operates with undivided energy in each person of the Trinity. The Father is not idle in the economy of salvation, but works in and through the Son and the Spirit, who are officially subordinate to him. Hence, all their working may properly be referred to him, without denying their free, personal, omnipotent agency.

(2) That the Holy Spirit is often called the Spirit of God; for example, in 1 Cor. 12:5.

Reply. So, too, is he called the Spirit of Christ; for example, in Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; 1 Peter 1:10, 11; Acts 16:7; Phil. 1:19. He may have been designated by

the term, "Spirit," because of the special work which he performs in the hearts of men. Moreover, we cannot say that the phrase, "Spirit of God," indicates a more perfect union or identity of the Father and the Spirit than really exists according to the Trinitarian hypothesis. But this objection suggests that the Being who is often called Holy Spirit in the New Testament may be the same who is called Spirit of God in the Old Testament.

(3) That the Holy Spirit is represented as being the same to God which man's spirit is to man; for example, in 1 Cor. 2: 11.

Reply. This statement is too strong. Paul asserts that God is fully known by his Spirit only, — just as a man is known by his own spirit. This is the particular resemblance insisted on by the Apostle; and we are not authorized to enlarge it by affirming that God's Spirit bears the same relation in other respects to the divine nature which the spirit of a man does to human nature.

We see no good reason, therefore, to doubt the correctness of our conclusion, as stated above.

In regard, however, to the whole doctrine of the Trinity, it may be well for us to take the advice of Augustine to Consentius, ii. p. 458, ep. 120: "Nunc vero tene inconcussa fide, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum esse Trinitatem, et tamen unum Deum; non quod sit eorum communis quasi quarta divinitas, sed quod sit ipsa ineffabiliter inseparabilis Trinitas.... Et quidquid tibi, cum ista cogitas, corporeæ similitudinis occurrerit, abige, abnue, nega, respue, abjice, fuge. Non enim parva est inchoatio cognitionis Dei, si antequam possimus nosse quid sit, incipiamus jam nosse quid non sit." "Hold thou with unshaken faith that the Father and Son and Holy Spirit are a Trinity, and yet one God; not that what is common to them is, as it were, a fourth Divinity, but that the Trinity itself is ineffably inseparable.... And whatever corporeal similitude may occur to thee when thou reflectest on these, avoid, refuse, deny, abhor, reject, flee from it. For it is no small beginning in the knowledge of

God, if, before we are able to know what he is, we begin to know what he is not."

(4) Yet it is possible to deny too much, as well as to affirm too much, in respect to the Trinity. An able writer errs, perhaps, in the former direction. His definition of the Trinity is as follows: "a. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one God. b. Each has a peculiarity incommunicable to the others. c. Neither is God without the others. d. Each with the others is God." This definition is in itself unobjectionable on the positive side; but it allows of the following denials, which seem to us out of harmony with the New Testament: "In God are *not* three wills, three consciences, three intellects, three sets of affections." "He is one substance, and in that substance are three subsistencies; but the subsistencies are not individualities."

We do not like the word "individualities," as applied to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; but we are satisfied that the New Testament represents them as distinguishable in a personal respect; that is, the distinction between them is of a personal nature. For it teaches (a) that the personal pronouns — *I, thou, he, we, they,* — are applicable to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, — separately or collectively, — three egos, or consciousnesses. (b) That the Son is said to do the will of the Father, and the Spirit to be sent by the Father and the Son — three centres or faculties of voluntary action. (c) That the Father knows the Son and all that he does, while the Son knows the Father and all that he does; and the Holy Spirit knows the very depths of God, — three centres of knowledge. (d) That the Father loves the Son, and the Son the Father: while the Holy Spirit is grieved at the coldness of Christians, — three sets of affections.

Thus we are taught that the Father, Son, and Spirit are personally distinguishable. Objectively, and in re-

spect to the universe, their knowledge, will, conscience, and affection are one in comprehension and aim; subjectively, each is personally, though not in substance, distinguishable from the others.

Says Dr. Pepper: "When we designate the one only God in the completeness of his being, life, and activities, we do not use the singular neuter pronoun "it," nor the plural personal pronoun "they," but the singular personal pronoun "He." His *uni*-personality is more *abundantly* attested than his *tri*-personality. Both are adequately attested. If we are to say that his self-consciousness is triple, it is not in such sense three that it cannot be, and is not, also, one. In Him as in us the self-consciousness as one affirms oneness of being, and the triplicity of consciousness, we know, affirms triplicity within the One Being."

3. *Identity of the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of God.*

We infer that the terms, "Holy Spirit," and "Spirit of God," as used by the sacred writers, are frequently, and perhaps generally, equivalent, from those passages: —

(1) Which interpret the latter appellation by the former: Acts 2: 16 sq.; cf. Joel 3: 1-5; Acts 10: 38; cf. Luke 4: 18; and Isa. 61: 1, 2; see also Mark 12: 36.

(2) Which ascribe the same functions to the Holy Spirit, and to the Spirit of God. For example, —

a. That of quickening the understanding of men for important service: John 11: 51; Rom. 12: 6-8; 1 Cor. 12: 28 (cf. verse 7); Ex. 31: 3, 6; 35: 31, 35; 1 Kings 3: 7-12; 4: 29; Judges 3: 10; 6: 34; 1 Sam. 11: 6; 16: 14.

b. That of inspiring men to teach the will of God: John 14: 26; 15: 26; 16: 13; Luke 1: 67; Acts 21: 11; 2 Pet. 1: 21; 2 Sam. 23: 2; 2 Chron. 20: 14; Ezek. 11: 5; Micah 3: 8; and Judges 6: 34; 1 Chron. 12: 18; 2 Chron. 24: 20; cf. Luke 24: 49.

c. That of working directly in their hearts, to sanc-

tify them: Rom. 5:5; 15:16; John 16:8-12; 3:3-8; Ps. 51:8-14.

It would, perhaps, be going too far, were we to affirm that the phrase, "Spirit of God," as used in the Bible, refers uniformly and distinctively to the Holy Spirit.

Having considered the deity and personality of the Holy Spirit, we are now prepared to study his relation to *the Beginning of Christian Life.*

That the Holy Spirit in carrying out the will of Christ is the Originator of such a life may be inferred from several representations of Scripture.

1. *Those which speak of the origin of spiritual life under the figure of generation or birth:* 1 Peter 1:3, 23; Titus 3:5; John 1:13; 3:3, 5-8; 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; cf. 1 Cor. 4:15; Gal. 4:19. The circumstance that God, instead of the Spirit of God, is spoken of in many of these places, should occasion no surprise. For so closely is the Father connected with the Holy Spirit and the Son, that it may be truly said, whatever either of them does God does. No one can enter into the meaning of the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters of John and feel any doubt on this point.

It is sometimes thought that the agency of the Holy Spirit in the new birth is that of imparting somewhat of his own essence to the soul; that, in fact, the substance of man's spiritual being is increased from the divine substance, and that this is implied by the language of Peter (2 Pet. 1:4), who speaks of his readers as "having received precious promises that through them they might become partakers of divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world through desire." Especially do trichotomists find in these passages an argument, for the literal inertness of man's spirit, — the highest constituent of his being, — before conversion.

But this is attaching to the word "nature" a sense which it will hardly bear. How the promises of God could be the means of conveying to men God's essential nature is not evident, but how they should be a means of revealing to them his loving kindness and truth, and of bringing them into a state of moral likeness to him is easy to see. "Divine nature" is equivalent, in this passage, to divine character or holiness. The words *παλινγενεσία* (from *πάλιν* and *γένεσις*), *ἀναγεννάω* (*ἀνά* and *γεννᾶω*), and *γεννᾶω* with *ἄνωθεν*, or *ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος*, or *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, all signify the new birth as coming from above, that is, from God or the Spirit of God.

2. *Those which speak of the origin of spiritual life in man under the figure of a resurrection from the dead:* Rom. 6: 4, 5, 8, 11, 13; Eph. 2: 5, 6; Gal. 2: 19, 20. Resurrection is of course understood to be a divine act. The dead do not raise themselves; only divine power can effect such a change in the condition of man. In the passages cited from his Epistle to the Romans, Paul speaks of Christians as walking in "newness of life," and as being "alive from the dead." In the one from his Epistle to the Ephesians he says that "God made us, being dead in sins, alive with Christ." The moral quickening of believers is here conceived of as involved in the reanimation of Christ: (cf. Rom. 8: 29, 30; 2 Cor. 5, 15.) Their final resurrection and exaltation are also assured by his own: (cf. Rom. 1: 4).

In the passage from the Epistle to the Galatians Paul refers to the change in question as double, — as dying to law, that is, to self-righteousness, self-confidence, or self as supreme, and rising to a new life which has God for its end, and Christ, instead of the human ego, as supreme. His language agrees with the view that in the unrenewed heart, self holds the place which belongs to Christ. The passage in his Epistle to the Romans: 6: 2-14, also refers to this double change, or rather to the two aspects or

sides of the change. Notice that from one point of view this entrance upon a new life is dying to the old life; yet it does not imply the extinction of any faculty of the soul or a diminution of its essence in any respect. It only implies a new kind of life, a ceasing to do evil as truly as a beginning to do well.

3. *Those which speak of the beginning of Christian life under the figure of a creation, or a new creation:* 2 Cor. 5:17; Eph. 2:10; Gal. 6:15, "So that if any one is in Christ he is a new creation; the old things passed away: behold, they have become new" (*καινά*). "For we are his workmanship (*ποίημα*), created (*κτισθέντες*) in Christ Jesus unto good works" (*ἔργοις*). "Put on the new man who was created after God (*τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα*) in the righteousness and holiness of truth": Eph. 4:24. So, too, in Col. 3:9, 10, "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye put off the old man with his deeds, and put on the new man, who is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him who created him."

The noun translated "creation" and the verbal forms translated "created" are always used in the New Testament, with one possible exception, 1 Pet. 2:13, to signify an originating divine action, or the result of such an action; and the result of that action is something which did not exist before. It is not an old germ developed, but a new kind of being or life. When the water was changed into wine, there was a new creation; the old element passed away; it became new. So the old man does not cease to live, but his life becomes a new and richer and sweeter life; with the change in his spirit all the works and ways of God appear to be changed.

4. *Those that speak of the beginning of Christian life under the figure of a divine calling or drawing unto Christ or into light:* John 6:44; 1 Cor. 1:24; (cf. John 12:32; 5:25-29; 11:43; Rom. 8:28, 30; 1 Pet. 2:9;

Eph. 5:8; Acts 26:18; 1 John 2:9, 10). The calling referred to appears to be what is meant by effectual calling: it certainly means a call that is heard and answered; and the light is that which reveals Jesus Christ in his divine loveliness.

Remark. The work of the Holy Spirit in originating Christian life does not conflict with the freedom of the human will, does not violate the laws or abridge the liberty of the soul, any more than did the action by which the soul was brought into existence. The work of the Spirit is sub-conscious, and therefore cannot be resisted by the will of man. But the effects of that work may be respected or resisted; the feelings or convictions which are supported by his action may be resisted. If it were a compulsory movement on the soul it would probably have been expressed by some other term than "call." Luke, indeed, affirms that "the Lord opened the heart of Lydia to attend to the things spoken by Paul": Acts 16:14; and this language suggests some influence of the Spirit of God which predisposed her to welcome the gospel. But we are not able to define its character more exactly. It was nothing which compelled belief; it tended to produce a candid, spiritual, receptive temper which responded to the Apostle's message with faith in Christ. It is, however, to be noted that Lydia was one that worshipped God before hearing the truth from Paul, and therefore the work of the Spirit may have been sanctifying rather than regenerating.

IV. Relation of Men to the Beginning of their Christian Life

This cannot be fully explained; for no man who is a Christian can be sure as to all that preceded and accompanied this change in his spiritual condition. Yet observation, experience, reason, and the Word of God suggest a few things which commonly precede this great

event. It may be said that, with the exception of those who are imbecile or die in infancy, very few, comparatively, begin a Christian life, save those —

1. *Who have some knowledge of the gospel.* This may be inferred in a general way from the great commission: Matt. 28: 19; Mark 16: 15, 16, from the language of Paul: Rom. 10: 17, 18, and from the history of mankind. We do not say that no man has been regenerated without hearing the gospel; but there is reason to look upon the state of the heathen as deplorable.

2. *Who give earnest heed to the gospel.* God does not often impart the new life to a careless soul, — to one who pays no serious attention to the truth. It may be only for a short time; but generally, if not always, the unrenewed man takes hold of the word seriously before the decisive change.

3. *Who are fully convinced of their own guilt:* Acts 2: 37. It is true, that many who are converted at the present day seem to have but a faint sense of personal guilt before the change; but they have some sense of it, and they have no doubt whatever of their actual sinfulness. In former times, a deeper conviction of sin seems to have generally preceded a change of heart.

4. *Who are truly anxious to be saved:* Acts 2: 37; 16: 30. "To be saved," we mean, from eternal death, from the penalty of sin, and perhaps from sin itself, as involving that penalty. Beyond this, the carnal heart does not go. It has no desire for God and holiness in themselves, and no hatred of sin as such. The conscience, indeed, condemns sin; but the heart loves it. Self cherishes self, and refuses to God his place. Men sometimes think they hate sin as sin, before conversion; but they are surely mistaken. Certain forms of sin shock their sensibilities; but mere sin, as against God and right, they do not hate. For to hate sin is to love righteousness.

5. *Who feel their need of help, in order to be saved.* One who believes that he can do all that must be done to deliver himself from sin, and render himself acceptable to God, is not likely, while cherishing that belief, to be renewed by the Spirit of God. Men are commonly made to feel their need of divine help, before it is granted. Sometimes they are led to the brink of despair, in their efforts to make themselves right, before the grace of God enters their hearts.

(1) Commenting on Matt. 9:20, ff. Maclaren says that

"faith precedes love, and the predominant motive impelling to faith at first is distinctly self-regard. That is all as it should be. The most purely self-absorbed wish to escape from the most rudely pictured hell is often the beginning of a true trust in Christ, which, in due time, will be elevated into perfect consecration. Some of our modern teachers who are shocked at Christianity, because it lays the foundation of the most self-denying morality in such 'selfishness,' would be none the worse for going to school to this story, and learning from it how a desire, no nobler than to get rid of a painful disease, started a process which turned a life into a peaceful, thankful surrender of the cured self to the love and service of the mighty Healer." Maclaren here uses the word "faith" to denote the merest act of *trust* in a person, viz., Christ. Can such trust in a person exist without some tincture of love? See (2) *infra.*

(2) By suggesting that some knowledge of the gospel commonly precedes the beginning of spiritual life, we do not mean to intimate that none of the heathen possess such life; much less do we mean to intimate that none of the Israelites before the time of Christ possessed it. We rather believe that much of the gospel was known to the Israelites; in particular that the holiness of God and their own sinfulness, together with God's mercy through sacrifice, were apprehended by some of

them, so that it was possible for them to be saved on gospel principles. The same was probably true of many Gentiles in the time of Christ. They were not ignorant of all religious truth. Indeed, the words of Paul in his letter to the Romans: 10: 17, 18, show that he conceived the language of the nineteenth Psalm, which describes the works of nature as glorifying God everywhere, to be true for the peoples of his own age. The same fact he had previously affirmed in his letter: Rom. 1: 19, 20, though without expressing his belief that men had availed themselves to any saving extent of the knowledge put within their reach. He was, however, certain that they did not perish for lack of knowledge.

(3) In attempting to mention some of the antecedents to the beginning of spiritual life in sinners, they have not been supposed to experience or to do anything which fulfills the command to repent or believe or seek forgiveness, anything which places God under obligation to create them anew in Christ Jesus. Indeed, nothing which an impenitent man does establishes a claim to the mercy of God. His thinking, his anxiety, his sense of need, his prayer, all spring from a heart unreconciled to God (cf. Turretin I. 318 sq.). The most a sinful heart ever does is to give up hope in itself and cry, "Lord, save, or I perish." Only this, before the new life begins in child-like submission and trust, fully accepting the help of Christ.

But with what action of the soul does Christian life begin? The question is a very difficult one to answer, because the inward life is a unit, all phases of it being joined by the closest ties. The Christian graces grow in a cluster, most of them existing in germ from the first. Yet there may be detected a possible order of dependence in nature, if not of succession in time. We therefore set them down with some hesitation as follows: —

1. *Repentance* (μετάνοια) which is an inward turn-

ing from self to Christ, from the way of sin to the way of righteousness, a radical change of mind from a moral and religious point of view. The word is never employed in the New Testament to express mere regret or remorse, without any change of moral purpose or aim.[1] This inward turning is the beginning of the new life considered as a unit.

2. *Faith,* which, in the case of one who knows the gospel, is genuine trust in Christ as his personal Saviour. According to Dr. W. R. Williams, "faith in Christ is the very first outgush of the new-found spiritual life." It is logical evidence of the beginning of this life, for it is an expression of it.[2] It is not reflexive; it does not lean upon itself, whether weak or strong; it is the trust of the soul, conscious of its own sinfulness, in Jesus Christ, the all-sufficient Saviour. "We are indebted," writes Dr. Gordon, "to John Henry Newman for the saying that sincere faith is utterly unconscious of itself, like the atmosphere, the transparent medium for seeing Christ, and only visible when clouded with our feelings and emotions." Faith is, primarily, receptive of good.

3. *Love,* which is a supreme preference of soul for God in Christ as the supreme Good, together with a voluntary good will to all men. "The glory of God is the end of the new creature; self, the end of the old man."[3] Love is communicative, and a higher grace than faith; for "it is more blessed to give than to receive." In the thirteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians Paul asserts unequivocally the primacy of love.[4] The words ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη are generally used in the New Testament to

[1] *Trench's* "Synonyms of the New Testament," and *Thayer's* "Lexicon of the Greek New Testament," *sub voce,* μετάνοια, and μετά in composition.

[2] See *Gordon* (Dr. A. J.) "The First Thing in the World."

[3] *Charnock.*

[4] See *Drummond's* "The Greatest Thing in the World."

denote Christian love. Especially are love to God and love to enemies expressed by these words rather than by φιλέω and its derivatives.[1]

4. *Hope,* which expects further good and is logically dependent on faith. It held a prominent place in the experience of the Apostles. It lays hold of eternal things: Rom. 8:24, 25; 2 Cor. 4:17, 18; 1 Pet. 1:3, 12. People sometimes have faith with little hope.

5. *Spiritual discernment.* The great spiritual activities of the soul, faith, love, and spiritual discernment, seem to be interdependent. True knowledge of God begins with trust and good will. Feeling depends upon vision, but it is also true that vision depends, in many cases, upon feeling. It is as difficult to know one whom you do not love as it is to love one whom you do not know.

V. Relation of the Gospel to the Beginning of Christian Life

This topic has been briefly noticed in speaking of Christ's relation to the beginning of the new life. But it is one of some difficulty and deserves further consideration. For there have been theologians who insisted that a clear presentation of truth is the only thing necessary to bring sinners to repentance and union with God. Men are sinners because they are in mental darkness. Their views of God are dim or erroneous, therefore they do not love him. Their views of the way of life are vague and misty, therefore they feel no interest in the work of Christ. Men will turn into the right way as soon as they see it. On the other hand, there have been theologians who insisted that sinners have knowledge enough to be saved, but they do not relish what it requires. They see the truth, but refuse to obey it. All

[1] See *Trench's* "Synonyms" and *Cremer's* "Dictionary of Theological Terms in New Testament Greek," *sub vocibus.*

the light of heaven would not bring them to God without a radical change of disposition, without a direct work of the Spirit on the springs of love in their souls, changing their moral quality. This view was advocated by Dr. Asa Burton, and was called the "Taste Scheme"; it was opposed by Dr. Emmons, whose theology was called the "Exercise Scheme." Our resort must be to the word of God for instruction.

Christian truth, or the gospel, is spoken of as the means employed to effect this change, the beginning of spiritual life in sinners: e. g., in 1 Pet. 1:23; 1 Cor. 4:15. These passages will repay study.

1. There are many other expressions of the New Testament which show the connection of religious truth, if not of the full truth of the gospel, with the beginning of spiritual life in men: *e. g.*, Matt. 28:19; Rom. 10:17; Matt. 13:37, 38; Luke 8:11. The apostles of Christ were commanded by him to make disciples of the nations, evidently by preaching to them his gospel. The necessity of this preaching in order that men may have faith in Christ, is affirmed by Paul. And the relation of this truth to a life of faith is taught by Jesus in his parable of the good seed and the tares. Religious truth is, therefore, in some sense a means of the new birth, and, in a sense very obvious and intelligible, a means of faith, love, hope, and every other movement of Christian life.

2. If it be asked, How does truth tend to move the unrenewed soul towards God? it may be answered in the words of Dr. Northrup:

> "There are four legitimate motives or principles of action to which the Holy Spirit appeals to persuade men to seek salvation, viz., rational self-interest, the feeling of obligation, the natural principle of gratitude, and aspiration for something higher and better than they are or have."

These appeals are fitted to move the soul to seek for

peace with God, but they will not prevail, except as the Spirit prepares the soul to welcome and follow them. For in the last analysis truth is not life, though it may represent and suggest life. Hence as life comes from life, motion from motion, energy from energy, love from love, we cannot think that truth is the deepest source of Christian life. It is rather a means and a help to life. Nay, it is indispensable to conscious life and fellowship with God.

3. But how are the work of the Spirit, the influence of truth, and the action of the sinner related to each other at the turning point, the beginning of Christian life? A change is to be effected, without compulsion, in the aim and affection of a free personality. A new direction and movement of soul he must voluntarily appropriate. This he will not take the lead in doing because of his reigning self-love.

(1) But both the Spirit of God and the influence of truth concur in moving him to repent and cast himself on the mercy of Christ. Their influence conditions his action. Under their influence his new life begins. Hence prayer for the work of the Holy Spirit should always be joined with preaching the gospel to sinful men.

(2) If a further question is raised, Do the Holy Spirit and the truth act upon the soul in different ways, but each directly and for the same moral end, or does the Holy Spirit act upon the truth and only reach the soul through the truth? we regard the former account of their co-agency as much more probable than the latter, for it is impossible to conceive of truth as charged with any other power than that which it has as truth. And even if it were charged with an energy distinct from its own, that energy would act in its distinctive way on the soul; it could not change the nature of truth, or give it more than its own efficiency.

(3) The new birth includes the first conscious work-

ing of the new life; it has a conscious as well as an unconscious side, both of which are necessary to its completion. The principle of life, the new disposition, is given by the Holy Spirit; but the action of this spiritual life, as required by God, and experienced by us, is absolutely dependent on truth. There can be no holy desire, affection, or volition, except in view of truth. The conscious image of Christ in the soul is produced by the Word of God. The Holy Spirit makes the soul sensitive to the light of truth at the very instant when that light, pouring in upon it, originates as a means the visible image of Christ, — the new life of faith and love. It is the action of the spirit which prepares the plate; it is the influence of truth which brings out the picture. The soul must be made susceptible, or the light of truth falls upon it in vain.

VI. Relation of Baptism to the Beginning of Christian Life

This relation is not, like those already named, originative, mystical, or instrumental, but rather declarative, confessional, and probative. It is only a solemn confession of faith in Christ, and, therefore, of having already come into possession of the new life. Yet a large part of Christendom believes that the beginning of Christian life depends upon the sacrament of baptism.

1. Thus, the Council of Trent, *Sessio* VII., decreed that

"the most holy sacraments of the church are the means by which all true righteousness begins, or when begun is increased, or when lost is restored." An anathema is also pronounced on every one who affirms that "the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or do not confer this very grace on those who present no obstacle, as though they were merely external signs of the grace or righteousness received by faith," etc.; so, too, an

anathema is pronounced against every one who says that "children, because they do not exercise faith, are not, when baptized, to be reckoned among the faithful," etc.

2. According to the Augsburg Confession, the Lutherans

"teach concerning baptism, that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered: also that children should be baptized, since, offered to God by baptism, they are received into his grace. They condemn the Anabaptists, who disapprove the baptism of children and affirm that children are saved without baptism."

3. According to the Liturgy of the Church of England for the public baptism of infants, the minister is required to say, after baptizing the infant,

"We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock"; and still further, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits," etc.

It is not, therefore, surprising that the sacramental wing of the Church of England is greatly assisted by the Liturgy. For the language of the Liturgy plainly teaches the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and gives to those who hold this doctrine to be true a great advantage over all others in that communion.

Before examining the words of Scripture which are supposed to teach this doctrine, it will be proper to take account of several important facts, namely: —

(1) In the Apostolic age, baptism was regularly preceded by repentance, faith, etc.: See Acts 2:37-41, "Then they that welcomed his word were baptized"; 8:12; 16:14, 31-33; 18:8; (cf. Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:6; Matt. 3:1-11; Mark 1:4, 5; Luke 3:8.)[1]

[1] For the import of the expression, "works [or fruits] meet for repentance," see Acts 26:20, and compare Luke 23:41, and 2 Macc. 4:25.

(2) Persons were sometimes filled with the Holy Spirit, — that is, baptized in the Holy Spirit, and so endowed with miraculous gifts before baptism: Acts 10:44-48, "Can any one forbid water that these should be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" These gifts, as a rule, presuppose regeneration, and furnish credible evidence of it; hence they were said to justify baptism.

(3) Baptism is described by the Apostle Peter, as "the answer of a good conscience": 1 Peter 3:21, "baptism = the answer (requirement, inquiry, or request) of a good conscience toward God"; but a good conscience implies obedience to God: 1 Tim. 1:5, 19; 3:9 (cf. 2 Tim. 1:3); Heb. 9:14; 10:22; 13:18.

(4) Administering the ordinance of baptism was esteemed by Paul subordinate to the work of preaching: 1 Cor. 1:17, 18, 21, "Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel .... For the word of the cross is ... to us who are being saved ... the power of God." This is very evident, not only from the language found in the verses here cited, but also from the way in which he generally refers to the work of preaching.

(5) This Apostle claims to have begotten the Corinthian Christians by the gospel; while he disclaims baptizing them, except in a few instances. See 1 Cor. 4:15, "For in Christ Jesus, through the gospel, it was I that begot you": 1:14, 15. Is not this decisive?

With these facts before us, we turn to the passages which have been supposed to teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, namely: John 3:5, "Unless one be born of water and (the) Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God"; Titus, 3:5; Eph. 5:26; and 1 Peter 3:21; Acts 22:16. On the first three of these texts, we remark: —

a. If they refer at all to the rite of baptism, they do not prove the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; for it

may be truly said that baptism is the symbol of regeneration, — the prescribed expression for it; and no true Christian of the first age could have thought of any substitute for it in acknowledging the change which had been wrought in his soul. The inward change and the outward expression of it must have been very closely united in the minds of Christians. Each would suggest the other; and forms of speech would be transferred from one to the other.

Hence Christ, in his discourse with Nicodemus, virtually said, "To be a true member of my earthly kingdom, you must be born again, ritually and spiritually; you must submit to the rite of baptism, and experience a renovation of heart by the Spirit of God; you must not only confess me openly in the prescribed way, which you are unwilling to do, but must also be the subject of a great spiritual change effected by the power of God" (cf. Rom. 10:9 for the same order of thought, the rhetorical instead of the logical order).

The only other interpretation which seems probable is this, that no one without a birth from water = forgiveness of sins, and from spirit = implanting a new spiritual life, can enter the Kingdom of God. For cleansing is but another name for forgiveness.[1]

b. In the Epistles to Titus and the Ephesians, Paul blends the inward change with the outward expression of it, even as he does also in Rom. 6:2 sq., and Col. 2:11, 12. The two he regarded as practically inseparable: true belief in Christ involved the prescribed expression of it, and *vice versa.*

c. If this be the correct interpretation of these passages, they agree in sense with 1 Peter 3:21, and Acts 22:16. Professor Charles Hodge remarks, that, "when any declaration or service is the appointed means of pro-

[1] Cf. Acts 22:16 and 2:38 with the Appendix to the Gospel of John in "An American Commentary on the New Testament."

fessing faith and obedience, making such declaration, or performing such service, is said to secure the blessings which are promised to the faith thereby professed." [1] To understand such language, it is only necessary to bear in mind, that, in the apostolic age, it was, as a rule, indispensable. (a) To be baptized in the name of Christ, in order to confess him before men; and (b) To confess him before men, in order to be saved by him. See Matt. 10: 32, 33; 12: 30; Luke 14: 26, 27, 33.

By the limiting clause, "as a rule," we design to except such cases as follow: *a.* those who had not bodily health or strength to be baptized; *b.* those who could not find a suitable person to baptize them; *c.* those who were prevented from receiving it by their parents; *d.* those who were prevented solely by a distrust of their own piety. Baptism has never been a prerequisite to salvation, except as obedience to the known will of Christ is such a prerequisite.

It is not certain that either of the first three passages refers to baptism. Neither of them contains the word which commonly denotes this rite. It may be that the work of the Spirit in regeneration is characterized figuratively as a cleansing, purifying work by the words "water," "bath," and "bath of water." This is a very obvious and natural interpretation of the passage in Titus; and scarcely less so of the words of Christ in John, and of Paul in his letter to the Ephesians.

[1] "Way of Life," p. 267.

CHAPTER II

GROWTH OF CHRISTIAN LIFE

I. Relation of the Father to the Growth of Christian Life

LIFE implies growth. It begins in comparative weakness, but in proper conditions is expected to increase in compass and vigor and richness. This is evidently true of spiritual life. The Apostle Peter exhorts his readers to "grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ": 2 Pet. 3:18, and the Apostle Paul writes to the Thessalonians, "The Lord make you increase and abound in love toward one another and toward all": 1 Thess. 3:12. But what relation have the Father, the Holy Spirit, the Gospel, and Christians themselves to the growth of the new spiritual life? We are first to consider that of the Father, as suggested by the Scriptures.

1. *The Father is represented as the One who justifies believers in Christ.* This is evident from the language of Paul in Rom. 1:17; 3:21, 30, "being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus . . . that he may be . . . the justifier of him who believes in Jesus": 4:5; 8:30, 33; 10:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:8. Moreover it is the grace of God that leads him to justify any. Even faith in Christ has no saving virtue in itself. As an affection or act of the soul it is inferior to love, and neither of them is half as steady or strong as it ought to be. Hence the Apostle asserts with great clearness of terms that justification is an act of free grace on the part of God. In himself, apart from Christ,

even a believer has no claim to it: Rom. 3:24. See also passages referred to above and Rom. 4:4, 16; 5:15; 11:5, 6; Eph. 1:6, 7; (cf. John 3:16; 1 John 4:9, 10, 19; Acts 20:24; 1 Cor. 1:4; Eph. 2:7, 8; 2 Thess. 2:16; Titus 2:14).

This view of the case is yet more obvious, when the act of God is simply denominated forgiveness of sins. For no one would think of himself as having a right to forgiveness; much less would any one who had a just conception of the dreadful guilt of sin dream that any thing in his own action could entitle him to pardon. Forgiveness, in order to be forgiveness, must be unmerited. Yet, from another point of view, it is an act of righteousness: 1 John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." But, in this passage, the faithfulness referred to is fidelity on the part of God to his promise; and righteousness is that attribute of God which insures such fidelity. In a certain sense, therefore, the penitent believer has a title or claim to the mercy of God, but not "in and of himself"; his title is in Christ, to whom he is joined by faith; and this brings us to another section.

2. *The Father does this by accepting believers in Christ as his adopted children, no longer under law but under grace.* The verb which is translated, *to justify,* occurs thirty-eight times in the New Testament, and mostly in books written by Paul, or by his companion, Luke. Thus Matt. 11:19; 12:37; Luke 7:29, 35; 10:29; 16:15; 18:14; Acts 13:39, twice; Rom. 2:13; 3:4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 6; 6:7; 8:30, 33; 1 Cor. 4:4; 6:11; Gal. 2:16, 17, four times; 3:8, 11, 24; 5:4; 1 Tim. 3:16; Titus 3:7; James 2:21, 24, 25.

3. An impartial study of these passages, with others in the Old Testament where the corresponding Hebrew

word occurs, will convince any one that it is properly a legal term, and signifies to *pronounce one right or righteous in the forum of grace,* being removed from the forum of law: Ex. 23:7; Deut. 25:1; 2 Sam. 15:4; 1 Kings 8:32; Isa. 5:23; 43:9. It never signifies to *make* a person righteous, but always, for one reason or another, to *declare* him righteous.

Note, *first,* that it is used of the decisions of an earthly tribunal: Isa. 5:23; Deut. 25:1; and also of the decisions of the Supreme Ruler at the last day: Matt. 12:37; Rom. 2:13, 16. *Secondly,* that it is used as the opposite of condemnation: 1 Kings 8:32; Prov. 17:15; Matt. 12:37; Rom. 8:33, 34. And, *thirdly,* that it is used as virtually equivalent to the act of forgiving sins, or of not imputing iniquity: Acts 13:38, 39; Rom. 4:6-8.

4. Pardon, or forgiveness, and justification are separable in thought. Pardon assumes that there is guilt; justification says that there is none. But, in the case of sinners who believe in Christ, the two are but different sides of the same act. For God forgives no one whom he does not at the same instant justify; and he justifies no one whom he does not at the same instant forgive. Hence the sacred writers use the terms as if they were equivalent; or, since one involves the other, they do not deem it necessary to mention them both in the same connection: See Mark 1:4; Luke 1:77; 3:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 26:18; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; and Luke 18:14; Rom. 3:24; 5:9; 8:30; Titus 3:7.

In the order of nature, pardon precedes justification; for a sinner cannot be pronounced righteous before the law until his sins have been forgiven; yet in time and effect they are inseparable and equal, though not the same.

It may be added, —

(1) That justification does not set one free from the

law of God as a rule of duty: Rom. 6:1, 14, 20; 7:5, 7, 9; Gal. 3:19, though it does set him free from it, as a rule by which he is to be finally acquitted or condemned. Antinomianism is a dangerous perversion of the doctrine of grace.

(2) That justification does not secure for one the same treatment in all respects which he would receive if he were free from personal sin. Bishop Devenant remarks, "God absolves the justified from all punishment that is retributive; but not from all that is chastening and medicinal."

(3) That pardon and justification are complete from the first moment of their existence. God does not forgive a part of the believer's sins, or pronounce him partially just before the law. He forgives all, and declares the pardoned sinner righteous, or free from condemnation.

(4) Yet this statement is by no means inconsistent with the theory of continuous pardon and justification. The relation of the believer to Christ is ever dependent on a vital union between the two: 1 Peter 1:5, "by the power of God guarded through faith"; and the blessing of justification may well be conceived of as being perpetually renewed. Hence David could pray for the pardon of his great sin: Ps. 51:1. Hence, likewise, all Christians ought daily to pray for the forgiveness of their sins: Matt. 6:12.[1]

5. *The Father accepts or justifies believers in Christ* ON ACCOUNT OF *what Christ has done and suffered in their behalf.* His work is the meritorious cause of their justification, as may be learned, —

(1) *From the direct testimony of God's words:* for example, in Rom. 3:24, 25; 5:9, 18, 19; Eph. 1:7; Gal. 3:13; 1 John 2:2, 12.

[1] *Preuss* (E.), "Die Rechtfertigung des Sünders vor Gott," —"Sechster Abschnitt: Beständige Vergebung," s. 119.

The first of these passages describes men as justified "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus"; and this redemption is said to be in him, because the righteousness of God has been illustrated by his propitiatory death. In the second, men are represented as having been "justified in the blood of Jesus," who had died for them while they were sinners. In the third, it is said that "as through one trespass it came upon all men unto condemnation, so also through one righteous act it came upon all men unto justification of life." In Eph. 1:7, the Apostle speaks of Christ as the one "in whom we have the redemption through his blood, — the remission of our trespasses"; and in Gal. 3:13, he declares that "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us." It woud be difficult to express the fact of justification through the vicarious death of Christ in plainer language than this.

(2) *From the indirect testimony of God's Word:* Matt. 26:28, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many, unto remission of sins"; 1 Cor. 1:30; 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 1:4; Col. 1:14; Heb. 9:22; 1 Peter 2:24 (cf. Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38).

The whole of our argument for the vicarious efficacy of the atonement may be referred to in support of the statement which we have now made in respect to the ground of justification. A review of that topic will afford ample evidence of the proposition above expressed.

6. *The Father justifies men on condition of their union with Christ by faith.* For unbelief in Christ, as the Saviour of sinners, or a refusal to accept of pardon on account of his self-sacrifice, would be an insuperable obstacle to a sinner's justification; and, therefore, faith or trust in him is very properly said to be a condition of justification. Some have preferred to call it a prerequisite rather than a condition; but we see no difference between the two words in this connection. Without faith in Christ

crucified, no one can receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance with the saints in light. This is the plain meaning of the inspired writers: Mark 16:16; John 3:36, "He that believes on the Son has eternal life; but he that disbelieves the Son shall not see life"; also John 6:40; Acts 16:31; Gal. 2:16; 3:22; 1 John 5:10, 12; Rom. 3:22, 28; 4:5, 13, 14; 5:1; Gal. 3:6 sq. 26; Eph. 2:8; 3:17; Phil. 3:9; Heb. 11:6.

(1) From the testimony of the Word of God, therefore, it appears that trust in Christ, rather than sorrow for sin, or love to God, is the proper condition of justification; not as working, but as trusting, are men justified or forgiven. Hence faith does not justify as being in itself righteousness or obedience, or even a germ of righteousness, or an equivalent for obedience; but as a total renunciation of all claim to personal righteousness, and a sole reliance upon Christ for acceptance with God. "The glory of faith is, that its utter emptiness opens to receive consummate good." Christian faith is the act of a sinner who sees himself to be a sinner, and utterly renounces all trust in his own works, whether internal or external, — all confidence in his own love, or trust, or humility, and casts himself without reserve on the mercy of God in Christ. It is, therefore, quite as truly distrust of self, as it is trust in Christ. It cannot live without doing good; but it can do no good in which it has any confidence as satisfying the law of a holy God.

(2) Yet it is certainly an attitude of the human spirit well pleasing to God, inasmuch as it is honest to itself and to God, inasmuch as it admits the perfection of God's law and is grateful for his grace by the help of which it will be at last delivered from sin. And therefore, as an indispensable condition of acceptance with God, the sacred writers speak of it as being — of course in a secondary sense — the source (ἐκ with the genitive), or the instrument (with the dative of the noun), or the

means of justification (διά with the genitive): Rom. 1:17; 3:30; 4:16; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23; Gal. 2:16; 3:5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 24; 5:5; Acts 3:16; 15:19; 26:18; Rom. 3:28; 5:2; 11:20; 2 Cor. 1:24; Rom. 3:22, 25, 30, 31; 2 Cor. 5:7; Gal. 2:16, 20.

(3) The more decisively we emphasize the spiritual union and fellowship of believers with Christ, the more reasonable will the doctrines of grace, as taught by the New Testament, appear. The spiritual union of the believer with Christ is such, that he has true fellowship with the work of Christ. He endorses and accepts it, so far as possible, as his own. He acknowledges the law of God to be holy, and its penalty just. In dying to sin, he dies with Christ; entering into the meaning and necessity of the Saviour's death, and feeling that, if it were possible, he would gladly suffer in the same way, and for the same great end, — the honor of God, and the good of men. Hence, we say that the imputation of Christ's work is mediate, not immediate, — to the believer as such, and not to the elect as such. A moral union is prerequisite to the legal one.

The logical order of the process of redemption seems to be this: a. Election by God, the Father; b. Regeneration by the Holy Spirit; c. Union with Christ by faith; d. Justification on account of Christ's self-sacrifice.

7. But what has justification by God, the Father, to do with growth in grace or sanctification? Almost everything, if one may judge by the writings of Paul, of Augustine, of Luther, of Bunyan, or of Spurgeon. "Therefore, being justified by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." "And not only so, but also rejoicing in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation." "And if children, also heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if indeed we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him." "And

whom he justified them he also glorified." "If God is for us, who is against us? He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how will he not also with him freely give us all things?" "God is he that justifies, who is he that condemns?" Rom. 5: 1, 11; 8: 17, 30, 31, 32.

"Why not live upon Christ always, and especially as he standeth the mediator between God and the soul, defending thee with the merit of his blood, and covering thee with his infinite righteousness? . . . Can there be any greater comfort ministered to thee than to know thy person stands just before God — just and justified from all things that would swallow thee up? Is peace with God and assurance of heaven of so little respect with thee that thou slightest the very foundation thereof, even faith in the blood and righteousness of Christ?"[1]

Most intelligible is the fact that a consciousness of pardon, of adoption, and of gracious help in escaping from the bondage of sin, must be a wellspring of courage and devotion to every believer in Christ, and especially to every believer who has had deep experience of the guilt and plague of sin. It must stimulate him greatly to put off the old man with his deeds, and to put on the new man, who is being renewed after the image of his Creator and Father. Justification springs from the holy fatherhood of God, and puts the believer into the atmosphere and influence of his blessed family.

Paul felt that only by a monstrous perversion of this truth could it be used to excuse one's self in sin. "What then? Are we to sin because we are not under law, but under grace? Far be it! . . . Thanks be to God, that ye were servants of sin, but obeyed from the heart that form of teaching unto which ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, became servants of righteousness. . . .

[1] "Of Justification by an Imputed Righteousness," by *John Bunyan.*

But now, being made free from sin, and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end eternal life": Rom. 6:15, 17, 22. It seems to be unnatural and incredible that any man who is united with Christ by faith, should not look with the utmost horror upon his own sins which brought upon Christ such awful suffering, or that he should continue to do that which is so utterly offensive to his gracious Father in heaven. Are not gratitude and love stronger motives to well-doing than fear?

8. *The relation of the Father to the growth of believers in their Christian life may also be seen in his providence.* That this tends to increase the purity and fruitfulness of Christian life may be inferred:

(1) *From the language of God's Word.* This may be seen a. In respect to prosperity: Ps. 145:7; Rom. 2:4, "Not knowing that the goodness of God is leading thee to repentance." b. In respect to adversity: Rom. 5:3 sq., "Knowing that affliction works patience," etc.; 1 Cor. 11:32; Heb. 12:6; 2 Cor. 4:17. c. In respect to all events: Rom. 8:28, "All things work together for good to those who love God"; 2 Cor. 4:15; Eph. 5:20; 1 Cor. 3:21, 22.

Query: Does the *πάντα* of Rom. 8:28 include the sin of those who love God? We do not find it easy to reply. Steudel[1] remarks that,

> "Sin — in case we do not give ourselves up to its power — often impels the conscience to hold the truth before us more distinctly and sharply than it would otherwise have done. A close observer of himself will scarcely be able to say that he has not been greatly benefited by a deeper knowledge of his own heart, and by a more thorough use of Christian truth at his command, even when these were occasioned by a sin which revealed to him the depravity of his moral nature."

[1] In the Chr. Rev. XXVI., p. 241.

(2) *From experience and observation.* Such is the union of soul and body in man, that the latter often solicits the former to sin; but its power to do this may be greatly weakened; for example, by disease. Hence the Christian may be made to experience want or weakness, for the purpose of fitting him to welcome the truth as a little child, with humility and trust in Christ. So, too, prosperity may increase his thankfulness and power to benefit others. When it will do this, God is able and willing to bestow it.

And no one can be certain how great is the influence of nature upon his spiritual moods and susceptibilities. The stars in their courses fight against evil. Earthquake and tempest reveal to man his weakness, and fill his spirit with awe. The clouds and the winds speak to him impressively. The changes of life often touch his soul with mysterious power. It is not uncharitable to suppose that most men fail to appreciate the subtle and gracious influence of the Father's ways in providence, especially as tending toward the new life in Christ. Yet the question meets us, Does God so direct events as to make them promote, in the highest degree, the sanctification of every believer, without limitation through the needs of others? Or may that of one be delayed for the sake of greater good to others? *Non liquet.*

II. Relation of Jesus Christ to Growth in Christian Life

1. This is most intimate and vital. Jesus said to his disciples, "I am the vine; ye are the branches." "I am the way and the truth and the life." "No one comes to the Father, but through me." "He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood, has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." "He that has seen me has seen the Father." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if ye

shall ask anything of the Father in my name he will give it you": John 15:5; 14:6; 6:54; 14:9; 16:23. "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls": Matt. 11:29.

2. Equally clear is the language of Paul in respect to the union of believers with Christ. They are in him, and he dwells in them. "Being in Christ" is one of his standing descriptions of Christians. He prays that the "love of the Philippians may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all discernment... [they] being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ": Phil. 1:9, 11. "For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God": Col. 3:3. "Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts.... Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom": Col. 3:15, 16. "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus": Phil. 2:5.

3. Similar is the teaching of John: "He that has the Son has the life; he that has not the Son of God has not the life." "And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ." "Who is he that overcomes the world, but he that believes that Jesus is the Son of God?": 1 John 5:12, 20, 5. In this connection it should not be forgotten that John remembered and recorded the words of Jesus which have been quoted above from his Gospel. Compare the words of Peter, "But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ": 2 Pet. 3:18.

4. The testimony of Christians is well nigh unanimous, that the life and character of Christ, as portrayed in the Gospels, make the highest appeal to their spiritual nature, and move them most powerfully toward holy action. He gives them the clearest view of the Father's holiness and love. In him they have a vision of the true God and, at the same time, of the perfect man. In him they perceive

the point at which the human and the divine may become one, that is, in moral aim and temper.

5. Jesus Christ comes into the lives of his friends by means of his words and acts, as recorded in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels. They are thus enabled to "think his thoughts after him," and to discover the spirit which animated him through life and in death. And, like Paul, they seek in this way "to know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death": Phil. 3: 10. It is certain that Christians of ripe experience find in the life of Jesus Christ an inexhaustible fountain of holy light and impulse. He is the Revealer of the Father, the Giver of the Spirit, the Head of the Church, the Fulfiller of all righteousness; and by looking to him Christians are brought into fellowship with God and with all who love him.

III. Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Growth of Christian Life in Believers

Growth in Christian life is but another name for sanctification. For sanctification, as a process, consists in a gradual increase of faith, love, hope, etc., and in a gradual decrease of pride, avarice, sensuality, in a word, selfishness. Probably the best way to secure a decrease of evil is to work for an increase of good. As love to God and man grows, selfishness sickens and dies. "Infinite toil would not enable you to sweep away a mist; but by ascending a little, you may often look over it altogether" (Arthur Helps). "The first duty is to attach one's self; detachment comes afterwards" (Vinet). "Positive faith must go before all negative exercises of self-denial and mortification. To mortify the flesh in order to vivify the spirit, is to reverse the Divine order." Yet Paul says to his Roman brethren, "If by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Notice then,

1. *That divine knowledge is traced to the Holy Spirit as its source:* 1 Cor. 2:13, 14, 15; 1 John 2:20, 27; Eph. 1:17; Col. 1:9. In the first of these passages, Paul represents the unrenewed man as unable to receive the things of God, because they are spiritually understood; while the renewed man rightly estimates all things, he appreciates the truth. In the second of them, John speaks of the Holy Spirit as an unction, or anointing, from Christ the Holy One.

2. *That the Christian virtues are traced to the Holy Spirit as their source:* Gal. 5:22; Rom. 12:3; 1 Cor. 12:3, 9; 2 Cor. 4:13; cf. Phil. 2:13. In the first of these passages (Gal. 5:22), "love, joy, peace, forbearance, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control" are said to be the fruit of the Spirit; and in verse 5, of the same chapter, the Christian's expectant waiting for future acceptance and glory is ascribed to the Spirit's agency in his heart. In the second passage: Rom. 12:3, Paul teaches that God gives to every believer the measure of faith which he possesses (cf. 1 Cor. 3:5); and, if we interpret this in harmony with 1 Cor. 12:3, 9, it will be seen that he gives this faith by the operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul.

3. *That Christian conduct and worship are referred to the Holy Spirit as their source:* Rom. 8:14; Gal. 4:6; Eph. 5:18, 19. In the first of these texts: Rom. 8:14, the sons of God are said to be led or moved by the Spirit; in the second, Christian prayer is ascribed to the influence of the Spirit (cf. Rom. 8:26, on which Augustine remarks, "*Non Spiritus Sanctus in semetipso, sed in nobis gemit, quia nos gemere facit*"); and in the third: Eph. 5:18, 19, the proper singing of spiritual songs is made consequent on being filled with the Spirit (cf. also 1 Cor. 14:15; and Phil. 1:6).

4. *That the Christian's conflict with his evil propensities, and his victory over them, are traced to the Holy*

Spirit: Rom. 8: 13; Gal. 5: 17. In the former of these passages, Rom. 8: 13, we are taught, that, by the assistance of the Spirit, believers slay, or put an end to the deeds of the flesh, — those acts which are prompted by a carnal mind; and, in the latter: Gal. 5: 17, the Spirit is said to strive eagerly against the flesh ἐπιθυμεῖ (cf. 5: 19, 20).

5. *That the spiritual life of believers depends upon their union with Christ, who dwells in them by his Spirit*: John 15: 1-6; and perhaps 14: 16-21; Eph. 3: 16, 17; Rom. 8: 8-10; (cf. 1 Cor. 3: 16, 6: 19; Eph. 2: 22). Van Oosterzee remarks that,

> "What Paul says of the Holy Ghost as *indwelling* within the believer, refers us to the highest blessing of the New Covenant, in which the Holy Ghost is the immanent, vital principle of the redeemed. During the Old Testament he overshadowed momentarily individual holy men of God; in the New he abides perpetually in the heart of each Christian."

This account of the Spirit's work in Old Testament saints may well be questioned; for the Psalmist prays, "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy Spirit from me," and sings of the Lord as his Shepherd leading him constantly and restoring his soul. In the one hundred and thirty-ninth Psalm, there is a wonderful description of the omnipresence of the Divine Spirit, and there are many evidences that the devout believed him to be always with them, searching their hearts. It is more than probable that God's grace was communicated to them in nearly the same ways as it is to us. How fully this was revealed to them is another matter.

6. *That the work of sanctification is directly ascribed to the Holy Spirit:* 2 Thess. 2: 13; 1 Peter 1: 2; 2 Cor. 3: 18. In the first of these texts, belief of the truth is placed in logical order after the Spirit's working; that depends on this. In the second, election is said to be realized in sanctification wrought by the Spirit. Both

these texts refer especially to the first act of the sanctifying work, but without excluding the remainder. In the third, we have the progressive transformation of the believer into the image of Christ attributed virtually to the Spirit. "But we all, with unveiled face, beholding in (Revised Version, "reflecting as") a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, *as by the Lord, the Spirit.*" That is to say, the transformation is such a one as might be expected from the working of the Spirit of Christ.

Remark. (1) The doctrine of the trinity underlies and explains the various representations here given.

Remark. (2) The indwelling or gracious working of the Spirit is, therefore, really the indwelling of the Father and the Son as well.

Remark. (3) Regeneration, inspiration, etc., are ascribed to the Holy Spirit; and, as the work of sanctification belongs to the same sphere of action with these, analogy would lead us to refer it to the same agent.

Remark. (4) In the economy of our salvation, the office-work of the Holy Spirit seems to embrace whatever is done within the human soul by special divine agency.

IV. Relation of Believers to the Growth of Christian Life in Themselves and Others

Believers are free moral agents and their action, especially so far as it is Christian, has a very important influence on their sanctification. Paul was unceasing in prayer, was unwearied in labors for Christ, was heroic in trial, and was earnest in withstanding bodily temptation. Thus he pressed towards the mark, and finished his course.

1. One of the forms of Christian life by which believers may contribute to their own growth in grace is true *worship*.

By worship we mean the homage of the soul paid to God in view of his attributes and prerogatives. This homage may be directly expressed in praise, and then it involves a corresponding admission of the worshipper's dependence, and perhaps guilt; or it may be implied only, while the worshipper testifies his sense of dependence and guilt. In further considering the topic before us, we first speak of the nature, the duty, and the efficacy of prayer.

(1) Prayer is said to have four elements: namely, a. Adoration, or homage to God in view of his nature, or the sum of his perfections, sometimes expressed by the single word, "holiness"; b. Thanksgiving, or homage to God in view of his beneficence; c. Confession of sin, or homage to God in view of his righteousness; d. Petition for favors, or homage to God in view of his grace and faithfulness.

(2) There are a few things worthy of particular attention in the teaching of Christ as to prayer by his people:

a. Their petitions should be offered either to himself, or to the Father in his name: John 14:13; 15:16; 16:23, 24. "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask and ye shall receive." To ask in the name of Christ is, therefore, something more than to ask in his spirit, *i. e.*, with a filial, trustful, obedient spirit; for it cannot reasonably be doubted that the disciples had thus prayed many a time already. Something else must be meant, trust in Jesus as Mediator, Intercessor, Saviour. They must believe in him as well as in the Father: John 14:1. And God will give every answer to prayer in and through Christ. Jesus is now King, Dispenser of good to his people. Every blessing comes through him, and every request should be made through him.

b. This was understood by his disciples as not forbidding prayer or praise to himself: Acts 7:59; 9:14,

21. "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Is not this he who destroyed in Jerusalem those who call on this name?" (cf. Acts 1:24; 2:21; 22:16; 1 Cor. 1:2). Christ never refused worship that was offered him on earth; and the book of Revelation describes the heavenly hosts as paying homage to him: Rev. 4:11-14.

c. Neither does his relation to believers suggest any impropriety in prayer to the Holy Spirit. But the words of Jesus preserved by John may be taken as evidence that what has been called the Lord's Prayer was never meant to be a set form to be used by Christians in social worship. It was rather a type or model of prayer for the disciples of Christ at that stage of his ministry. With more knowledge of himself and his work they would naturally modify their petitions.

d. Prayer should never be dictatorial, but rather humble and trustful. Strong faith is perfectly consistent with submission to the supreme wisdom of God; for faith leans upon Christ, trusts his wisdom and love. No prayer is acceptable to God unless it is offered in faith, and no dictatorial prayer is offered in faith. "Prayer which thinks to command omnipotence is profane. Prayer that demands its own way is impious. Prayer which thinks to sweep the whole field of physical disease and convert it into a garden of the Lord must suffer defeat. True prayer is submission to the divine will. Sickness may be the cross for which we have asked, and by which we are to be raised nearer to God and better fitted for the land where sickness is unknown" (Presbyterian). But this thought must not be carried so far as to be incompatible with affectionate and importunate pleading for what is believed to be in harmony with the Lord's will.

e. Prayer should be often vocal. There are feelings which cannot be uttered, and there are circumstances when silent prayer is best; but when it can be offered

without ostentation or offence secret prayer should be vocal, for the single reason that the utterance of our desires by the voice strengthens them and expels foreign thoughts.

But two objections are urged against prayer in the form of petition, one founded on the ignorance of man, and the other on the order of nature.

(a) *On human ignorance.* Says one of the objectors, "I cannot express my repugnance at the notion that supreme intelligence and wisdom can be influenced by the suggestion of any human mind, however great." [1]

This very plausible objection will lose its force, if it be remembered,

a. That a great object in creation and moral government is the production of moral persons of real worth in the sight of God. But moral persons can only be trained to virtue by action which involves some degree of self-direction and responsibility for the conduct of others. And it is surely no more inexplicable that God should be influenced by prayer than by any other act or state of man. To deny the influence of prayer is to surrender a belief in the providence of God. The desires of a child must count for something in the mind of a father especially if that father has purposely endowed the child with a nature having desires which call for expression.

b. The Kingdom of Christ is in some respects republican. Every member of that kingdom takes an interest in the common welfare, and shares, to some extent, in the direction of affairs. Every one, however humble, is treated as a freeman and allowed to act in moral things. His coöperation in good is desired and welcomed. He is, therefore, informed as to the purpose and spirit of the supreme Ruler in this republic. This Ruler has the heart of a father towards all under his authority. He

[1] "The Prayer Gauge, p. 122.

treats them as children. His republic is a family, and even the feeblest child is instructed and encouraged to share in the common life. Hence, petition is normal, respectful, and useful. It offers the only means of filial intercourse with the great-hearted Ruler in time of need. Without it that intercourse would not fully and honestly express the filial spirit, and give all possible play to the free and growing nature of children. The fatherhood of God reveals the secret of prayer.

(b) *On the order of nature.* This is said to be sacred and inviolable. "I bless God, but I do not pray," wrote Rousseau. "What should I ask of Him? That he would change for me the course of things; do miracles in my favor? I who ought to love above all the order established by his wisdom and maintained by his providence, shall I wish that order to be disturbed on my account?" [1]

a. But to this we reply, What if that divine order includes in its wide embrace both prayer and its answer? What if prayer is a kind of action having a place and influence in the scheme of providence for the realization of true moral life? What if the fixed order is not so rigid as to be disturbed by the free play of finite spontaneity and choice within such limits as infinite wisdom may set? There is no problem brought into the study of nature by the Christian doctrine of prayer which is not brought in by the doctrine of any degree of moral freedom in created beings; nay, which is not brought in by the admission of human freedom in any form of activity. And nothing is more certain than that the spirit of man, renewed by the Spirit of God, not only prays spontaneously, but prays with an expectation of being heard and answered.

"More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.

[1] "Emile," Livre IV.

For what are men better than sheep or goats,
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friends?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

— TENNYSON.

b. Indeed, there is no conclusive objection to supposing that God often makes use of physical forces in answering prayer. For man can use those forces and is doing this constantly. Says Wallace, "We can anticipate the time when the earth will produce only cultivated plants and animals; when man's selection shall have supplanted 'natural selection'; and when the ocean will be the only domain in which that power can be exerted, which, for countless cycles of ages, ruled supreme over the earth."[1] But human intelligence and power are finite. Not so those of God! As author of natural forces, and intimately present with them, he can surely, in ways imperceptible to man, direct them to the accomplishment of such ends as he pleases. If prayer is acceptable to him, and if he chooses to answer it by making use of physical forces, there is nothing in the known character of these forces, or in his known relation to them to forbid his doing it.

c. Moreover, God may have preadjusted the forces of nature in such a way as to answer by them some of the prayers which are offered by his children. His knowledge is perfect, embracing from the foundation of the world every act of every one of his creatures. Why, then, may he not have provided for the answer of acceptable prayer through the working of natural laws? It seems to us that no one who admits the omniscience and wisdom of God can question the possibility or indeed the probability of such answers to prayer.

[1] "Natural Selection," p. 326.

d. Finally, one cannot deny the use of physical forces in answering prayer, without denying that it is answered at all; for all kinds of mental action are accompanied by corresponding modifications of the substance of the brain, and so of the body. Thus, spiritual forces change the action of physical forces; and indirectly, if not directly, God makes use of the latter, as well as of the former, in answering prayer. Is it credible that God cannot do that directly, which he can do mediately? Or is it reasonable to suppose that man can do what God cannot, in using the powers of nature to accomplish rational ends?

(3) If further evidence is needed to show the influence of prayer on the mind of God, and the fact that it is answered by granting the petitioner his request, or, something better than his request, it may be found in the teaching of Scripture, Matt. 7:7 f., "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you"; 18:19; 21:22; Luke 11:13; James 1:5 f.; 4:2, 3; 5:16 f.; 1 John 5:14 f.; Ex. 32:7 f. Christ himself prayed and taught his disciples to pray. From the ascension of Christ to the present hour the most earnest and efficient Christians have been men of prayer. Not men who believed in the reflex influence of prayer as the good to be directly sought by the needy soul, but men who believed in God as one who is a rewarder of those who seek after him. Nevertheless, it is also true that prayer is talking with God and fellowship with him, and that this is conducive to growth in grace; but only when it is sincere, when the soul means what it says, when it asks expecting to receive, then it does receive both in the act of asking, and because of the believing request.

(4) Rousseau speaks of prayer as if it were always a request for personal benefit or supposed benefit, and were never in behalf of other men. But this is far from

the truth. Though the first of all supplications may be the cry, "God be merciful to me, a sinner," it is not the one which is oftenest in the heart or on the lips of a Christian. He intercedes for others without hesitation, and sometimes with more zeal and trust than he speaks for himself. Parents, children, friends, neighbors, rulers, subjects, the poor, the sick, the disheartened, the wayward, all are remembered before God. Even enemies are commended to his grace when the believer turns to God in the name of Christ, and pleads for his blessing on mankind. The heart of the suppliant is enlarged as he thinks of human need and divine grace.

2. Another kind of action favorable to Christian growth is the *study of God's world and word and providence.* Prayer for spiritual light should always be accompanied by study. If we ask God for bread, we sow and reap, in order to coöperate with him in answering our own prayer. So likewise if we ask God for spiritual illumination, we should search the Scriptures, his word, examine his works, and observe his providence, in order to obtain from him the instruction needed. These are fountains of knowledge opened by him, and his grace will enable us to draw from them refreshing draughts. In nature nothing is too great or too small to contain a lesson from God. Order, relation, adjustment, purpose, taste, beauty, utility, fill our souls with wonder, and indeed with equal wonder whether we look at the starry heavens through a telescope or at tiny molecules through a miscroscope. The reverent study of nature will not fail to beget feelings of wonder and admiration.

The same is true of the study of Holy Scripture. Its lessons are surprisingly various and rich. Their meaning is inexhaustible. Simple biography, compressed history, apt proverbs, principles of law, rules of life, sacred lyrics, homely proverbs, suggestive parables, fervid arguments, solemn appeals, and uplifting predictions, follow each

other through the many parts of this divine library, demanding the closest attention and taxing the highest powers of reason and imagination.

No less interesting to many a Christian heart are the events of life in the light of divine providence. To study the relation of crime to wealth, of wealth to character, of character to intelligence, and of all these to government, is one of the most fascinating employments. And when God is seen to be offering himself to us in all these phenomena of life, the movements of his providence are an incentive to devout worship and unhesitating obedience.

3. But it is never to be forgotten that *doing his will* is prerequisite to the fullest knowledge. Christian growth is promoted by strenuous action, by loyal obedience, by resolute self-sacrifice for the good of others. To hear the word is not enough; to do it is still more necessary. To work for God in dependence on God is the law of life and growth. Hence believers are exhorted to run the race, to fight the good fight, to strive to enter into rest, to welcome the work of faith, and labor of love, and patience of hope, and, in a word, to live as Christ lived. Thus are they to work out their own salvation, knowing always that they are able to do it, because God works in them both to will and to work, according to his good pleasure.

PART FIFTH

CHRISTIAN SERVICE

PART FIFTH

CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Willing service to mankind is given a large place in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. It is treated as the best expression of love to one's neighbor, and accepted as true service to the Lord himself: Matt. 5:44 f.; 25:34-40. "In so far as ye did it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it to me." But it is worthy of notice that love to one's neighbor is virtually love to mankind in general, even though one knows but a few of the countless multitude. Conscious affection depends upon knowledge and actual service upon opportunity. But the will must often be taken for the deed. That one loves and serves a brother whom he sees is evidence that he would, if possible, do the same for the brother whom he does not see. We may therefore study Christian service in connection with the family, the neighborhood, the church, and the Lord's day.

CHAPTER I

IN FAMILY LIFE

1. The primary sphere of Christian service is the family. For mutual love is the natural bond of union between husband and wife, and at the same time the purest incentive to helpfulness. Through its influence each lives for the other. Envy has no place in their hearts, and the exhortation of Paul, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave himself up for it," Eph. 5:25, is seen to be full of sweet reasonableness. Opportunities for service of the highest quality occur daily. Frankness, kindness, integrity, patience are called for every hour. The firmest confidence in each other is necessary, and the most delicate regard for whatever things are righteous, pure, lovely, and of good report.

2. And when children are added to the home, opportunities for Christian service are multiplied indefinitely. Then first is the perfect idea of family life realized. Then husband and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, servants and neighbors, guests and strangers, meet under the same roof and hold converse together. Then authority and obedience, equality and generosity, candor and courtesy, are seen to flow from the deep well of loving kindness.

3. Family worship consecrates daily service and turns the eye of the spirit upward in daily prayer and thanksgiving. Parental care and love, transfigured by the Spirit of Christ, attempt their most arduous and yet hopeful work. The noblest sentiments and sweetest charities are here illustrated by conduct as regular as the pulsations of the heart. Character is tested in the home circle, and, if it rests on love to Christ, will there put on its whitest robes.

CHAPTER II

IN NEIGHBORHOOD LIFE

THIS is closely connected with family life. For, in the literal sense of the word, neighbors are persons or families that live near each other, and are therefore likely to meet often and to become well acquainted. In country districts they are more likely to have many interests in common than in cities. Sometimes there are meetings, societies, or amusements, bringing the people together and giving them similar tastes, convictions, or aims. Christian service of the utmost value is therefore possible. In many places it takes the form of neighborhood meetings for social worship. Christians of different denominations unite in them, and they are found to be exceedingly useful.

It is not easy to overstate the spiritual value of Christian service in the social worship of neighbors. Yet for this we are mainly indebted to Christian churches.

And this brings us to what may be called the positive institutions of the Christian religion. They belong to the second class of means for promoting the growth of Christian life, both intensively and extensively, both in the individual and in the world.

CHAPTER III

IN CHURCH LIFE

THE power of church life to promote the sanctification of men and the spread of Christianity will be made evident by a careful study of I. Christian churches and II. Christian ordinances. We proceed, therefore, to give some account of the constitution, the government, the officers, the sacred rites and the work of churches referred to in the New Testament.

I. Christian Churches [1]

Note especially that the functions of Christian churches are not exhausted in promoting the sanctification of their own members; they are aggressive as well as conservative organizations; they are employed by Christ in preserving the truth and edifying the saints, but also in diffusing the truth and subduing the world to Christ. In view of their twofold office we are justified in giving considerable time to our study of them.

[1] *Davidson* (S.), "The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament Unfolded," etc.; *Ladd* (G. T.), "The Principles of Church Polity"; *Jacob* (G. A.), "The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament"; *Dexter* (H. M.), "A Handbook of Congregationalism"; *Ripley* (H. J.), "Church Polity," etc.; *Pierce* (Wm.), "The Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists"; *Wayland* (F.), "Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches"; *Miller* (S.), "The Christian Ministry; or, The Primitive and Apostolic Order of the Church of Christ Vindicated" (Presbyterian); *Hort* (F. A.), "The Christian ἐκκλησία," a very scholarly Examination of the N. T. reference to the Ecclesia.

In regard to the constitution, government, and work of a Christian Church, the following statements may be made: —

1. *That the Apostles, either by word or action, have determined what ought to be the polity of Christian churches.*

1 Cor. 14: 33, 40; 12: 12 sq. (cf. 7: 15); 1 Cor. 4: 17; 7: 17; 11: 16, 34; Acts 14: 23; Titus 1: 5 (cf. Acts 20: 17; Phil. 1: 1, etc.); Heb. 13: 7, 17; Acts 20: 28; 1 Peter 5: 14; Titus 2: 15; 1 Cor. 9: 14 (cf. vs. 7-11); Gal. 6: 6; 1 Tim. 5: 17, 18; 1 Cor. 5: 1-13; 2 Thess. 3: 6 (cf. Matt. 18: 15 sq.; 1 Tim. 3: 15); 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; 14: 34-36 (cf. 1 Tim. 2: 12); Acts 14: 26, 28; 15: 2, 3.

These passages show

(1) That, in the Apostle's view, order should reign in the churches of Christ, every member filling his own place and doing his own work;

(2) That essentially the same principles and practices were taught by Paul in all the churches under his care, the practices resting upon the principles;

(3) That he was wont to organize churches, and appoint elders or pastors over them, wherever there was a group of converts;

(4) That these elders had everywhere substantially the same rank and work in the churches, and were to be treated accordingly;

(5) That they were, as a rule, entitled to a reasonable support from those for whom they labored, if they gave their whole time to the work; and

(6) That the churches, as such, were charged with the duty of maintaining Christian doctrine and discipline.

These various items fully justify our statement, unless it can be proved that the church arrangements of the apostolic age were temporary and provisional; and, if that can be shown, it will, of course, be impossible to prove that Christians are under obligation to form them-

selves into societies at all. But evidently the presumption is altogether in favor of our statement; and it belongs to those who deny the permanency of church-life and order to show cause for their denial.

2. *That the word "church" is used to denote a society of baptized believers, maintaining together the worship and ordinances of Christ, according to his revealed will.* For this use of the word "church," see Matt. 18:17; Acts 5:11; 8:1; 11:22, 26; 12:1, 5; 13:1; 14:23, 27; 15:3, 4, 22, 41; 16:5; 18:22; 20:17, 28; Rom. 16:1, 4, 16, 23; 1 Cor. 1:2; 4:17; 6:4; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16, 18, 22; 14:4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 33, 34, 35; 16:1, 19, and about ninety other passages in the New Testament.

The word *ecclesia* is possibly used once in the New Testament to denote all the churches in certain provinces, as being in some sense one: Acts 9:31. But there may have been but one organized church in those provinces. It is also used a few times (probably seventeen) of all Christians in heaven and on earth: See Eph. 1:22; 3:10, and thrice of a public assembly, whether orderly or not: Acts 19:32, 39, 41, if capable of civil action. But these uses of the word are exceptional, and the New Testament gives us no reason to connect the word "constitution," or government, with the word "church" when employed in either of these senses. The original and secular meaning of the word is of no importance to us, except as accounting for its ordinary Christian use. Twice it is used with reference to the Jewish assembly or congregation: namely, Acts 7:38; Heb. 2:12; but this use of the word does not shed any light on Christian Church polity.[1]

[1] Thayer refers to about fourteen texts in which he thinks ἐκκλησία is applied to the whole body of Christians on earth: viz., 1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 1:22; 3:10; 5:23, 27, 29; Phil. 3:6; Col. 1:18, 24; Acts 20:28; Gal. 1:13; 1 Cor. 15:9; 1 Tim. 3:15;

3. *The primary relation of the members of a Christian church to one another is that of equality and fraternity.* They are all brethren; all entitled to the same privileges, all kings and priests unto God: Matt. 23:8; Acts 6:3; 1 Cor. 8:12; Gal. 3:26 sq.; 4:7 (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12 sq.; Gal. 6:10; Eph. 2:18 sq.; Heb. 3:6; 1 Tim. 6:2; 1 Peter 2:9; Rev. 1:6; 1 Peter 5:3).

Hence, social and civil distinctions do not affect one's position in the church. A son may be the spiritual teacher and overseer of his father, or a servant of his master. Hence, too, in the church, men do not claim office as a right, but are put in office by the act of their brethren. Fitness for official service is the only good reason for appointment to it.

4. *In the last instance, it belongs to every church as a whole, and not to its officers, to exclude and receive members; the right to exclude presupposing the right to receive:* Rom. 14:1; Matt. 18:17; 1 Cor. 5:13; 2 Thess. 3:6, 14 (cf. Titus 3:10, 11); and see also Acts 1:23; 6:3, 4, 5; 15:2.

The members of a church cannot transfer their authority to others, for it is intrusted to them; and the use of it is a duty no less than a right. They may perhaps do a particular act, agreed upon, through representatives; but there is no Scriptural ground for more than this.

The conference at Jerusalem, Acts 4:15, may be thought to furnish an example of submitting a particular point to others for final decision; but neither that nor the nature of the case warrants a general transfer of rights and duties to any other body. For, in the *first* place, there is no valid reason to suppose that the church polity sanctioned by the Apostles is not adapted to all times and peoples, since true religion fits men for re-

and one text: Heb. 12:23; where it denotes Christians in heaven. But these may be interpreted as generic or figurative uses of the word.

sponsibility; and, in the *second* place, such a transfer, once made, cannot easily be revoked, and therefore, by making it, the members of a church interfere, more or less, with the rights and duties of their successors.

Whether all who belong to a church, or only the brethren should act in receiving and excluding members is debatable, see 1 Tim. 2:12; but, in a majority of Baptist churches, all are expected to act, if they see fit to do so. The voice of a majority is binding on the whole body. See 2 Cor. 2:6.

5. *The members of a Christian church ought to receive into the same such persons only as have been baptized on a credible profession of their faith, and as have reasonably correct views of Christian doctrine:* Matt. 10:32, 37, 38; 28:19 (cf. 16:16); John 3:5; 4:1; Acts 2:41; 8:12, 13; 1 Tim. 1:19, 20; cf. 1 Cor. 5:5, 13; Titus 3:10.

As the essential prerequisites for admission to a Christian church are given in the New Testament, no church can rightfully welcome to its fellowship persons who are not believed to have those prerequisites; nor is any church at liberty to insist on qualifications other than those virtually prescribed by the New Testament.

We say "virtually prescribed"; and we think that the last qualification named above, to wit, "reasonably correct views of Christian doctrine," is in this way prescribed, for it is implied in the law of discipline for heretics and errorists. A man who will probably sow error in the church that receives him ought not to be received; for the law of self-preservation and efficiency forbids it. But regard must be had to the age and circumstances of a candidate, in deciding whether he has "reasonably correct views of doctrine."

It may properly be added, that persons should be received to baptism and church membership as soon as they give to the members of the church satisfactory evidence

of their faith, and of their desire to obey the Saviour's commands.

6. *The members of a Christian church are responsible for the discipline of offenders belonging to the body.*

There are at least five kinds of offences, for any one of which a person ought to be excluded from the church, namely:

(1) Wrong-doing to a brother in the church, for which satisfaction is refused: Matt. 18: 15-17 (Matt. 5: 23, 26).

(2) Gross immorality of any kind: 1 Cor. 5: 1-13.

(3) Inculcating religious error: 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20 (cf. 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18).

(4) Creating division in the church: Titus 3: 10.

(5) Idleness, meddlesomeness, or disregard of manifest family obligations: 2 Thess. 2: 6 (cf. 1 Tim. 5: 8); also 1 Tim. 5: 19.

In case of flagrant immorality or crime, the offender ought to be promptly excluded, without waiting to see whether he repents or not; but, if he then gives convincing proof of repentance, he may in due time be restored.

No charge against an elder or pastor of a church should be received, unless it is sustained by two or three witnesses, — a rule which seems to presuppose eminent integrity and self-control in such an officer, making it particularly improbable that he will commit an offence worthy of discipline: 1 Tim. 5: 19.

In case of special doubt or difficulty, it is sometimes wise for a church to seek the advice of judicious brethren from without, or of a counsel of delegates from other churches, before giving its final judgment.

All the important business of a church ought to be transacted at meetings properly notified as business meetings, so that all members who desire to do so may be present and share in its action.

7. *It belongs to a Christian church to select for official service such of its members as it deems qualified for the same:* Acts 1:21 sq.; 6:3 (cf. 13:2, 3; 14:26, 27; 15:2).

The action of the church under the direction of the Apostles, before the day of Pentecost, cannot be relied upon as certainly expressing the mind of Christ; yet the presumption that it did so in the instance cited is very strong; for we find the Apostles, after the Pentecost, directing the church to repeat its action in the choice of another grade of officers. These two cases evidently establish a precedent, and reveal a principle; and we find nothing inconsistent with this precedent and principle in the later teaching of the Apostles. We have a right to presume that the churches were always called to choose their pastors and deacons, though the formal act of consecration was performed by apostles or elders.[1]

8. *As a rule, churches ought to respect the action of one another;* for, though organically separate, they are under the same law, animated by the same spirit, seeking the same end, and intrusted with equal authority.

(1) Hence the ordination of a minister by one church may be properly accepted by others as valid; yet this act is of such a nature as to render the advice of a council of delegates from several churches very desirable, if not prudentially imperative. Should the council deem the candidate presented unworthy of ordination, and thus disagree with the church calling it, the latter has power to go on and ordain the man; but it is rarely or never wise to do so; for the man thus ordained would have slight claim to be recognized by other churches as a competent and trustworthy minister.

(2) Hence, too, the discipline of one church should be treated as valid and just by other churches. Exceptions

[1] Compare "Clemens Romanus"; 1 Ep. ad Corinthios, c. 44, *σὺν εὐδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης.*

to this rule must be of very rare occurrence; for the relation of churches to one another is fraternal; and a spirit of mutual confidence ought to be cherished.

(3) This is what churches ought to be and ought to do, according to the apostolic teaching; but, if any so-called churches differ essentially in doctrine or in polity from the New Testament standard, their action need not, and oftentimes should not, be considered as valid.

9. *Without risk to self-control or separate responsibility to Christ, churches may combine their resources and influence for the furtherance of religious or benevolent enterprises:* Acts 11:29, 30; Gal. 2:10; 2 Cor. 8 and 9.

It is evident from these passages that, under the direction of Paul, a systematic and united effort was made by the churches of Macedonia and Achaia to assist, by a large contribution of money, their poor brethren in Judea. It also appears that a well-known and trusted brother was associated by the churches with Paul for transmitting this contribution.

But it does not appear that any ecclesiastical body, superior to the churches, was called into existence, or was engaged in this work. By what method the churches appointed the brother referred to, we are not informed. One church may have chosen him, and the other churches may have been asked to concur in the choice; or the several churches may have made the election by delegates empowered to act for them. It is plain, however, as before stated, that delegates can act for churches only in the particular matter intrusted to them. If they do more than this, their action can be only advisory, binding themselves, perhaps, but not the churches.

The members of a Christian church, fully organized for growth and service, may be divided into three classes, laical, diaconal, and clerical; and a few words must be said as to the particular functions of each.

10. *The lay members of a church are required to pay*

suitable deference to their officers, and, along with the deacons, to see that their pastors have reasonable compensation for their official work: Heb. 13:7, 17; Gal. 6:6; 1 Tim. 5:17, 18; 1 Cor. 9:14; cf. vs. 7-11.

Of course, they are to share in all the work of the church, previously described, every one endeavoring to serve the body according to his special ability: 1 Cor. 12:12 sq.; Rom. 12:4 sq. The decision as to what is reasonable pay for the official work done by a pastor must be left to the judgment of the whole church. But if any layman of means should differ from the church, thinking the pastors ought to be paid more than is judged to be a reasonable compensation by the body, he is not to be blamed for making up what he considers the deficiency.

It is doubtful whether a church has a right to fix the sum which each one of its members shall pay in support of public worship, and, in case of refusal, to deal with the delinquent by way of discipline. Nor is it certain that every member of a church ought to pay for the support of preaching in proportion to his income. Yet the salary of a pastor, though raised by voluntary contributions, is not a gift to him, nor alms from the church.

11. *The deacons of a church ought to assist the pastor in the subordinate duties of his office, especially in caring for the sick and the poor:* Acts 6:1 sq.; Rom. 12:7; 16:1, 2; 1 Cor. 12:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:8-12.

Whether the appointment of the seven Almoners of the church in Jerusalem, Acts 6:1 ff., was virtually the institution of the diaconate is still uncertain; but it is plain that such duties as they performed need to be provided for in almost every church of the present day.

It is sometimes thought that deacons, by virtue of their office, have charge of all the finances of the church; but there is no adequate proof of this. A church may select for its treasurer one who is not a deacon, or may

appoint a financial committee to look after pecuniary matters. The duties of a deacon are of a semi-spiritual character, and are determined by the amount of help which the pastor needs. In small churches, having pastors, there may be no occasion, for a time, for the service of deacons; yet it would be wise, even in such cases, to have at least one deacon who can take the lead, should the office of pastor become vacant.

From the statement of Justin Martyr, in his "First Apology," it is almost certain that deacons distributed the bread and wine at the Lord's Supper; but the New Testament does not allude to this as one of their functions.

Deacons should be selected for office by the church of which they are members, and which they are to serve; and may properly be set apart to their work by prayer and laying on of hands, — the pastor or bishop naturally leading in the consecration.

12. *The pastors of Christian churches are to watch over the churches which they serve, instruct them in the gospel, rebuke false teachers, and refute their errors, insist upon suitable discipline; and, in a word, be leaders, teachers, and examples to the flock in all spiritual things:* Acts 20: 17, 28; Eph. 4: 11, 12; Phil. 1: 1; 1 Tim. 3: 1-7; 5: 1, 17; Titus 1: 5-9; Heb. 13: 7, 17; 1 Peter 5: 1-4; 1 Tim. 4: 11-14; 2 Tim. 2: 2.[1]

[1] *Müller* (J.), "Von der göttlichen Einsetzung des geistlichen Amtes," Abhandlungen, pp. 468-657; *Nitzsch* (C. I.), "Praktische Theologie"; *Hoppin* (J. M.), "The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry"; *Vinet* (A.), "Pastoral Theology"; *Ripley* (H. J.), "Sacred Rhetoric"; *Wayland* (F.), "The Ministry of the Gospel"; *Cannon* (J. S.), "Lectures on Pastoral Theology"; *Beecher* (H. W.), "Yale Lectures on Preaching"; *Hall* (J.), "God's Word through Preaching"; *Storrs* (H. R.), "Preaching without Notes"; *Taylor* (W. M.), "The Ministry of the Word"; *Blaikie* (W. G.), "The Work of the Ministry"; *Porter* (N.), "Lectures on Homiletics and

For the use of the word *pastors,* see Eph. 4:11 (and cf. John 21:16; Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:2; Matt. 26:31; John 10:11 sq.; Heb. 13:20; 1 Peter 2:25). For the use of the word *teachers,* see Eph. 4:11 (cf. Acts 13:1; 1 Cor. 12:28, 29; 1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; 4:3; Heb. 5:12; James 3:1; 1 Tim. 3:2). For the word *bishops,* see Acts 20:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:7 (cf. 1 Peter 2:25; Heb. 12:15; 1 Peter 5:2). For *elders,* see Acts 11:30; 14:23; 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4; 20:17; 21:18; 1 Tim. 4:14; 5:17, 19; Titus 1:5; James 5:14; 1 Peter 5:1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1. For *presidents* or *leaders,* see 1 Thess. 5:12; 1 Tim. 3:11; (cf. Rom. 12:8); Heb. 13:7, 17, 24 (cf. Matt. 2:6; Luke 22:26; Acts 15:22).

That the words, "elder" and "overseer," or "bishop," refer to the same officer in a church is evident (1) from their being used interchangeably; (2) from the identity of qualifications required of them; (3) from the way in which overseers and deacons are named together, — as if they were the only officers of a church.[1]

Against this it is urged

a. That Titus had Episcopal authority in Crete: Titus 1:5; but there is no sufficient evidence of this. The brief direction of Paul is fairly accounted for, by assuming that Titus was an evangelist, commissioned to

Preaching"; *Broadus* (J. A.), "Preparation and Delivery of Sermons," and "History of Preaching"; *Vinet* (A.), "Histoire de la Prédication"; *Ehrenfeuchter* (F.), "Die Praktische Theologie," etc.; *Zincke* (F. B.), "The Duty and Discipline of Extemporary Preaching"; *McIlvaine* (J. H.), "Elocution: the Sources and Elements of its Power"; *Day* (H. N.), "The Art of Discourse."

[1] *Winer, Neander, De Wette, Meyer, Huther, Wiesinger, Bickell, Rothe, Jacobson, Alford, Ellicott, Conybeare;* see especially, *Mellor* (E.), "Priesthood in the Light of the New Testament," — a very spirited and able work. *Hackett* and others agree on this point.

effect a further organization of the churches by the action, or with the coöperation of the same. It is safe to presume that he performed a definite service in the usual way, but with Paul's authority.

b. That the "angels of the seven churches," addressed by John, were bishops or overseers, holding an office superior to that of "elders." There is, however, much doubt in the minds of good interpreters as to the significance of the word, "angels," in the passages referred to; and there is no evidence for the assertion that they were diocesan bishops. They may have been leading pastors of the seven churches, though this is doubtful.

c. It appears that many churches had more elders than one; and this may have been the case with all: Acts 11:30; Phil. 1:1; Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5. Yet the use of the singular number in 1 Tim. 3:2 and Titus 1:7, compared with 1 Tim. 3:8, 11, 12, has suggested the idea that there was but one pastor in some of the churches. In most of the larger cities, there were doubtless several small congregations as well as several pastors.

It will also be observed that bishops were overseers *in* the Church, and not lords *over* it: Acts 20:28; that, in distinction from deacons, they must be "apt to teach": 1 Tim. 3:9; and that they were to look after the spiritual interests of the Church by preaching, as their principal work: Titus 1:9.

d. There is scarcely sufficient ground for the opinion that elders were of two classes — teaching and ruling; but this may have been the case. The only passage which obviously suggests this view is 1 Tim. 5:17, — "Let the elders that preside well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in word and teaching." But the word translated "labor" means literally, "to work hard," "to weary or beat out one's self by labor"; and the Apostle may intend to say that such

as give themselves *exhaustively* to the ministry of the word deserve more respect and compensation than others. This is the view of Mosheim; and it appears to be very reasonable. Dr. Ripley thinks the word "elders," here includes deacons; and his judgment always deserves consideration. But it is not easy to determine what the verse means.

(a) The authority of pastors is moral, — depending on their character, their call from God, their Christian knowledge, and their position as religious teachers. They will be likely, in ordinary circumstances, to have all the respect and confidence which they deserve. They will mould their people, — "Like priest, like people." Probably ministers do not have as much control over their people as the New Testament authorizes them to have; but it is because they are not sufficiently wise and godly to win it.

(b) Pastors should be selected by the whole church which they are to serve; but, in the first instance, they should be set apart to their work by the aid and approval of a council of elders and laymen from other churches — the church which calls the council being represented in it. The service of ordination should include prayer, and the laying on of hands by the eldership: 1 Tim. 4:14. But, as we understand the matter, the vote of a properly organized council, recognizing one as called of God to the ministry, and deciding to set him apart to that work, is the essential act in ordination. All that follows is but a fitting announcement of this act; *first,* by the imposition of hands, publicly; and *secondly,* by solemn prayer to God for his blessing on the person ordained. It is this vote of a council (or of a church) which, under God, *authorizes* a given person to administer the ordinances, and to perform all the duties assigned to the ministry in well-ordered churches. Churches and councils should beware of acting hastily

or under pressure in ordaining persons to the ministry: 1 Tim. 5:22. All the preliminary steps should be taken prayerfully and deliberately by the church.

(c) While ordination does not impart any official gift or grace to him who receives it, it does promote order and efficiency in the churches; *first,* by keeping out of the ministry not a few persons who are unqualified for it; and *secondly,* by giving moral countenance and support to suitable men in and after entering it. Thus the churches are able to protect themselves, in a measure, against fluent and plausible men who do not hold the truth, and to secure a better class of "pastors and teachers" than they would otherwise have.

(d) But should ministers of other evangelical denominations be ordained, if they would become Baptist ministers?

Ordination for definite Christian Service

From the course taken by the church at Antioch: Acts 13:1-3, it appears that persons of acknowledged ministerial standing were *ordained to service in a new sphere of labor.* This ordination implied no criticism of their previous commission to preach the gospel. It merely set them apart to the same kind of work in a different sphere, demanding certain modifications of their work. On the same principle when a Pedobaptist clergyman wishes to enter the Baptist denomination as a regular minister, he may suitably be set apart by prayer and the laying on of hands to his work in the new sphere which he enters, — a sphere which modifies his work in respects so important as to justify the change of church connections which he is making. The essential point in such a case is that the council, after suitable examination, recognize by vote the person in question as qualified to do all the work of a regular Baptist

minister, and as worthy of the confidence of Baptist churches in doing the duties of the ministry. Whether the public service be called an ordination or a recognition is of less consequence. It will naturally share the characteristics of both. A generous recognition of past services in another sphere will accompany the God-speed and commission to service in the sphere now chosen.

It is often the duty of pastors and churches to take the initiative in directing the minds of suitable men to the work of the ministry. Women are not eligible to the office of pastor; but they may be made deaconesses, though not as substitutes for men: Rom. 16:1; 1 Tim. 3:11; cf. 5:3, 9.

13. *Evangelists are simply preachers of the gospel, or ministers who have no pastoral charge:* Acts 21:8; (cf. 8:40); Eph. 4:11; 2 Tim. 4:5. Many missionaries are strictly evangelists. As to the wisdom of setting apart a class of ministers for irregular, itinerant preaching, in a region where pastors and churches abound, there will be honest differences of opinion; but, in those parts of a country where there are but few churches supplied with pastors, evangelists are necessary.

14. *The Apostles and prophets of the first age have had no successors thus far; and there is no promise of them for the future.* Their work could be done once for all. But they still speak to us by the Scriptures; and their position, commission, and illumination were such that all Christians should obey their word.

II. Christian Ordinances

There are but two ordinances or sacred rites enjoined upon Christians by the New Testament; namely, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Both are emblematic of central

facts in the Christian religion; and together they teach in a very impressive manner the vital doctrines of the gospel. It is, therefore, important to understand their meaning and use, to guard against their misinterpretation, and to keep them as they were delivered by Christ to his Apostles, and by the Apostles to the primitive Christians.

Christian Baptism

We propose to consider the external rite, the significance of the rite, the subjects of the rite, and the relation of the rite to John's baptism.

1. *The External Rite*

Aside from the words employed, *the external rite of baptism consists in an immersion of the candidate in water, unto or into the name of the Triune God.*

That the rite includes an immersion of the subject in water is learned, —

(1) *From the meaning and use of the word* βαπτίζω, which was employed by Christ himself and the inspired Apostles to denote the rite. Strenuous and learned efforts have been made to show that the word in question does not point to immersion as the primitive rite; but these efforts are unavailing. The proper meaning of the word — a meaning which it has always retained in the Greek language, and a meaning which it always has, unless the circumstances of the case point to a tropical use — is immerse. The figurative applications of the word may all be traced back to this, as the literal and radical sense expressed by the verb. To this view the best lexicographers assent.[1]

[1] *Sophocles* (E. A.), "Greek Lexicon of the Later and Byzantine Periods," *s. v.;* he remarks: "There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put

(2) *From the use of* λούω, *and, perhaps,* λουτρόν *with reference to baptism.* Acts 22:16; (cf. 1 Cor. 6:11; Titus 3:5; Eph. 5:26; John 13:10; Acts 9:39; 16:33; Heb. 10:22; 2 Peter 2:22). On the first of these passages, Dr. Hackett remarks: "The sort of outward washing expressed by this verb has been noticed on 16:33. Hence, there can be no question as to the mode of baptism in this instance; for if it be maintained that βάπτισαι is uncertain in its meaning, a definition is added in ἀπόλουσαι, which removes the doubt." His note on the simple word in 16:33, is this: "This verb," says Dr. Robinson (Lex. N. T. *s. v.*), "signifies to wash the entire body, not merely a part of it, like νίπτω." Trench says: "νίπτω and νίψασθαι almost always express the washing *of a part* of the body . . . ; while λούω, which is not so much 'to wash' as 'to bathe,' and λοῦσθαι, or in common Greek λούεσθαι, 'to bathe one's self,' imply always, not the bathing of a part of the body, but *of the whole.*" The other passages cited merit careful attention, as confirming this account of the word. Baptism is a bathing.

(3) *From the circumstances mentioned by New Testament writers in connection with baptism:* Mark 1:9; John 3:23; Acts 8:38, 39. It is sometimes said that the reason for resorting to places where there was much water was this, that the people and their animals might be supplied with a very necessary means of refreshment and cleanliness. But this reason is nowhere suggested by the sacred writers; and it has never been shown that there was any such lack of water in Palestine, at that

upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks"; *Liddell* and *Scott,* "Greek-English Lexicon, based on the German work of F. Passow," *s. v.; Pape* (W.), "Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache," *s. v.; Robinson* (E.), "Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament," *s. v.; Grimm* (C. L. W.), "Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti," *s. v.;* "Stephani Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ," tertia edito, and other works.

time, that a multitude, even an army, could not subsist comfortably in any of the larger towns. Besides the natural sequence of thought in John 3:23 makes it almost certain that the abundant waters of Enon were convenient for administering the rite of baptism, and that the place was chosen on that account. "But John also was baptizing" — not holding great meetings, and preaching, but — "*baptizing* in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came and were baptized."[1] Alford's Trans.

(4) *From references to the ritual act, in stating its import*: Rom. 6:3-5; Col. 2:12. Says Lightfoot on Col. 2:12: "Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. . . . Thus baptism is an image of his participation, both in the death and in the resurrection of Christ. (See Apost. Const. III. 17). *The immersion is the dying with him; the emersion is the rising with him.* For this twofold image, as it presents itself to St. Paul, see especially Rom. 6:3 sq." And this is but a sample of the concessions made by those who do not insist on immersion. A very large number of scholars, belonging to churches that do not practise immersion, might be quoted in support of the view, that the passages cited above presuppose immersion as the customary rite in the apostolic age.

But, if it was the customary rite, what evidence is there that it was not the uniform rite? This evidence ought to be very clear, to be of any avail against the presumption in favor of a ritual act that was always meant to speak the same language. But, instead of being clear and stringent, this evidence is inferential and weak.

[1] See "An American Commentary on the N. T." at John 3:23.

(5) *From the practice of "the early churches,"* — meaning by this expression, the churches of the second century and the beginning of the third. This practice was evidently immersion; and it furnishes a presumption of more or less force in favor of immersion as the apostolic rite. No one ought to rely upon it with entire confidence; for it may have been one of the earliest errors that crept into the churches, as Coleman suggests; but it is not antecedently very probable that error would first enter at this door, since the Greek language was largely used in the West as well as in the East.

Pouring was indeed allowed in case of sickness; and Cyprian defends it on the plea of necessity. God will accept *compendia,* when the full service is impossible. But on whose authority does he say this? In such case, *compendia* are *dispendia,* as has been naturally suggested.

(6) *From the practice of the Greek Church down to the present time.* In proof of this statement, appeal may be made to many high authorities (for example, to Alexander de Stourdza, Russian State Councillor, and member of the Greek Church; to Dean Stanley, the historian of the Greek Church; and to Dr. Arnold, for many years a missionary in Greece). There may have been instances in which a priest has forborne to immerse an infant; but these instances must have been extremely rare. The almost if not quite uniform practice of the Greek Church is immersion; and I do not think any native Greek would admit that *βαπτίζω* means either to sprinkle or to pour.

(7) *From the concessions of those who practise affusion or sprinkling.* Among these may be named A. P. Stanley, G. F. Howson, F. W. Robertson, J. B. Mozley, Thomas Chalmers, E. Pressensé, Edw. Reuss, Daniel Schenkel, H. A. W. Meyer, W. M. L. De Wette, A. Tholuck, L. J. Rückert, A. Neander, H. Olshausen, F.

Bleek, H. Alford, C. J. Ellicott, J. P. Lange, J. B. Lightfoot, J. H. A. Ebrard, K. F. A. Kahnis in his "Die Lutherische Dogmatik historisch-genetisch dargestellt," II. p. 319, ff. besonders p. 337, C. F. Keil.[1]

(8) It has been customary to mention also *the use of the prepositions* εἰς, ἐν, and ἐκ, in connection with going into the water, being baptized in the water, and coming out of the water, as confirmatory of the view that the sacred rite included an immersion of the candidate; and this, at least, may be said with confidence, that the use of these prepositions is precisely what might have been expected, if the rite was performed by immersion. When both εἰς and ἐκ are used the inference is inevitable: Acts 8: 36-39. Nor is the circumstance that the element, water, is put several times in the dative without a preposition, thus denoting the means, — if, indeed, this is the true explanation of the dative in every such case, — any reason for denying that the rite was performed by immersion; for baptism is *with* water, whether it is immersion, or pouring, or sprinkling. Yet we do not see that much reliance can be placed on the argument drawn from the use of the prepositions named

[1] Of special examinations the following may be named: *Stuart* (M.), "Is the Manner of Christian Baptism Prescribed in the New Testament?" Bib. Repository, Vol. III., p. 208 sq.; *Ripley* (H. J.), "Reply to Stuart on Baptism"; *Dale* (J. W.), "Classic Baptism," "Judaic Baptism," "Christic and Patristic Baptism"; *Ford* (D. B.), "Studies on Baptism with Review of J. W. Dale"; *Carson* (A.), "On Baptism"; *Wieberg* (A.), "On Baptism"; *Conant* (T. J.), "On the Meaning and Use of Βαπτίζειν in Greek authors"; *Crystal* (J.), "A History of the Modes of Christian Baptism"; *Ingham* (R.), "Handbook of Baptism"; *Gotch* (F. W.), "A Critical Examination of the Rendering of the Word Βαπτίζειν in the Ancient, and Many of the Modern Versions of the New Testament"; *Matthies* (C. L.), "Baptismatis Expositio, Biblica, Historica, Dogmatica"; *Höfling* (W. F.), "Das Sacrament der Taufe"; *Dressler* (E.), "Die Lehre von der Heiligen Taufe."

above; though whatever bearing they have on the question is in favor, rather than against, the Baptist view.

But the following *objections* have been urged by Dr. Edward Robinson against supposing that the word "*βαπτίζω*" always retains its classical sense in the New Testament: —

a. It is used in Luke 11:38, to signify ablution, or affusion, as may be seen from Mark 7:2, 4, 8 (cf. 2 Kings 3:11). But, in this view, he differs from the ablest critics of Germany. Indeed, the references of Dr. Robinson prove nothing; because the circumstances are not described as similar. Couches, as well as smaller articles, were naturally plunged in water to cleanse them. If they included a frame, it was doubtless separable into parts, which could easily be immersed; but Tischendorf omits "couches" in his last edition.

b. He supposes that Acts 2:41 and 4:4 prove eight thousand persons to have been baptized in Jerusalem within a short period; and that there was not water enough in the city to immerse so many. We respond a. that there were pools in and around the city, large enough to immerse almost any number of persons in a few hours; for Dr. Hackett, who was not given to exaggeration, and who had visited the city, remarks "that the pools so numerous and large, which encircled Jerusalem . . . afforded ample means for the administration of the rite"; and adds, that "The habits of the East, as every traveller knows, would present no obstacle to such a use of the public reservoirs"; b. that a pool large enough for the immersion of one might serve for the immersion of five thousand in succession; c. that five thousand, instead of eight thousand, was the number of believers in Jerusalem at the time referred to in Acts 4:4; d. that it is by no means certain that three thousand were baptized on the day of Pentecost; yet the Apostles and their assistants could easily have bap-

tized this number in a few hours. Indeed, immersion may be administered in a reverent manner, as rapidly as sprinkling or pouring.[1]

c. He urges that *βαπτίζω* was transferred, and not translated in the early Latin version; hence it did not mean the same as *immergo*.

Reply. This transference of the word can be readily explained without supposing any difference of meaning between *βαπτίζω* and *immergo;* for the Greek language was generally understood, and largely used during the first three centuries of the Christian era. Hence the word "*βαπτίζω*," first used to describe the act of Christian baptism, would naturally become well known; and, like the word "*εὐχαριστία*," be retained, when other less important words were translated.

But it must also be said that the earliest Latin version of the New Testament, of which we have any traces, was the one used by Tertullian in North Africa; and that in this version the Greek verb is translated by *tingo* or *tinguo*.[2] Tertullian also used the nouns, *tinctio* and *intinctio,* to denote baptism. These words point to immersion as the ritual act, especially when compared with *mergo, immergo, lavo,* and *lavacrum,* which he employs likewise; but they suggest, at the same time, the idea of some sacred and mystical energy, imparted to the baptismal waters by the presence of the Holy Spirit, — the incipient doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

d. He says that certain baptismal fonts of an early date were too small for the immersion of adults, and must, therefore, have been used for sprinkling or pouring. But it may be remarked, in reply, that the fonts

[1] "The Design of Baptism, with Other Baptismal Tracts for the Times," p. 112 f.; *Barclay* (J. T.), "The City of the Great King"; *Robinson* (E.), "Biblical Researches," etc., I., p. 323 f.; *Williams* (George), "The Holy City."

[2] See *Rönsch* (H.), "Das Neue Testament Tertullians."

examined by him were subsequently examined by Dr. Hackett, and pronounced large enough for the immersion of adults. Surely, then, they were absurdly large for any other mode of administering the rite in question. Besides, it is difficult to fix the date of these fonts.

e. Others add to these objections the plea that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was conceived of and represented as an effusion; and therefore baptism with water must have been performed by affusion. This argument has been put in the forefront of the controversy by some Pedobaptist writers. But it seems to us destitute of any force; for the same operation of an invisible and spiritual agent may be represented by different figures of speech. And it is perfectly natural to represent a very abundant communication of the Spirit as being poured out from above, — from God, or from Christ; while, on the other hand, it might be, and it surely was represented by the word *βαπτίζω*, as encompassing the Apostles, and as being the very element or atmosphere of their new life. The two representations are distinct, but not inconsistent; for they present different sides of the same marvellous act. See Acts 2: 17, 18, 33; also Isa. 44: 3 (cf. Acts 1: 4, 5; Joel 3: 1-5).

But is it not true that, with those who reject immersion, sprinkling is more frequent than pouring? And does *ἐκχέω* signify to "sprinkle"? Was the Holy Spirit "sprinkled" on the Apostles? Were not their souls encompassed and pervaded by his presence? Was not the Pentecostal miracle a gift of new powers rather than a purification, even if sprinkling were the proper symbol of any other purification than that by atoning blood?[1]

f. As to the plea that Christianity is a spiritual faith, and therefore any thing like a scrupulous exactness

[1] See *Hague* (W.) in "Baptist Question," p. 76 sq.

in preserving the *form* of a rite is indefensible, we reply,

First, That in symbolical language the form is essential, for it expresses the meaning: the form of the rite is, largely, the rite, for the rite itself is a form; and

Secondly, That "it is of the essence of disobedience and rebellion to assume to make commutations and substitutions of duty, — to transfer obligation to where it would be less inconvenient that it should be enforced, and to affect to render, in the form of preferred and easier services, an equivalent for the obedience which the righteous and supreme authority has distinctly required to be rendered in that harder service which is evaded." [1]

As to the formula which should be used by the administrator of baptism, we think it is virtually given in Matt. 28: 19. Not that the words there recorded are necessary to the validity of the act, nor that the Saviour designed to have his words repeated as a prescribed form; but that they express briefly and clearly what ought to be said by the administrator. The preposition εἰς before τὸ ὄνομα signifies *into* or *unto;* and the telic clause signifies that the candidate enters publicly into a very close relation to the Holy Trinity, avowing himself a servant of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

An abbreviated formula, mentioning only the name of Christ, may have been sometimes used by the Apostles. See Acts 2: 38; 8: 16; 19: 5. But there is no certain evidence of this. From the time of Justin Martyr, A. D. 130, the formula given by Christ was carefully observed; and, we presume, it was by the Apostles themselves. It led perhaps to the long-continued practice of trine immersion.[2]

[1] *Foster* (John), "The Glory of the Age," p. 70.

[2] See *Crystal* (J.), "A History of the Modes of Christian Baptism," ch. VI.

2. *The Significance of the Rite*

In determining the significance of baptism, our appeal must be to the language of the New Testament on this point, and to the natural import of the rite itself; for ritual acts are, to a certain extent, self-interpreting, and there can be no reasonable doubt that, in most instances, their true meaning lies on the face of them, — that they were chosen as being a sort of universal language, readily understood by men of every age and nation. Hence, where the natural language of the ritual act accords with the explanation of it by the sacred writers, there remains no ground for doubt; assurance becomes doubly sure. And this is true in the present case.

From looking at the ritual act, and at the language of Scripture, we remark

(1) *That it symbolizes the regeneration of the subject, as being, on the one hand, a dying to sin, and, on the other, a rising to holiness:* Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12.

At the same time it symbolizes participation both in the death and the resurrection of Christ. See remarks quoted from Döllinger and from Messner, below.

(2) *That it commemorates the accomplished death and resurrection of Christ:* Rom. 6:3; Col. 2:12; Mark 10:38, 39; Luke 12:50.

Says Dr. Döllinger, "St. Paul made this immersion a symbol of burial with Christ, and the emerging a sign of resurrection with him to a new life." And Messner remarks, with equal clearness, "Peculiar to Paul is the manner in which he connects the two acts of the rite of baptism as then administered; namely, the submersion and the emersion, with the idea of fellowship with Christ in his death and resurrection, — a view which, in this definite form, belongs to him alone. While the submersion symbolizes the putting off of the old man, the emersion from the water is an emblem of the reception of a new divine life; and, because the former

is considered by him as an effect of the death of Christ, the latter is brought into connection with the resurrection of Christ. Thus Paul connects the *act of submersion with the death of Christ,* and *that of emersion with the resurrection of Christ,* — a symbolism of the baptismal rite which has lost its significance with the disappearance of the rite as then observed." [1]

The same explanation of the Apostle's language may be found in the works of numerous Pedobaptist scholars; and there is no good reason whatever for doubting its correctness.

(3) *That it represents this regeneration as a purifying change*: Acts 22:16; Titus 3:5; Eph. 5:26 (cf. 1 Peter 3:21). To this part of the symbolism of baptism, those persons who reject immersion attach almost exclusive importance; and they maintain that this part of the meaning symbolized is set forth as clearly by sprinkling as by immersion. But there is abundant reason to doubt whether biblical writers ever express the idea of purification by the sprinkling or pouring of mere water upon a person or object.

The only passage where this seems at first sight to be the case is Ezek. 36:25, — "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you," etc. But the words "clean water" should rather be "pure water," meaning the "water of purification," in which the ashes of the heifer of purification had been steeped. Num. 19:11-22 (cf. 8:5-22).

Says Hengstenberg, "The sprinkling with water has likewise the shedding of blood for its foundation. It was done with such water only as had in it the ashes of the sin-offering of the red heifer." (See Heb. 9:13, 14.) "It is very evident that there is an allusion in this passage to the Mosaic rites of purification; especially to the holy water, in

[1] *Messner* (H.), "Die Lehre der Apostel," pp. 279, 280.

which the ashes of the red heifer were mixed, and which served as an antidote, first to the greatest of all defilements, — contact with a corpse, — and then to defilements in general."

But washing or bathing in water is a natural symbol of purification; and if Baptists have not insisted on this as often as on other ideas symbolized by immersion in water, it is perhaps due in part to a reaction of feeling against the exclusive reference made to it by Pedobaptists; yet they have by no means failed to recognize this part of the meaning conveyed by the rite.

Says Dr. Irah Chase, "In baptism there is retained, in all its significancy, the idea of cleansing or purification; for the water in which we are buried is a purifying element. Thus there is a figurative washing away of sins, — a putting off of the body of sinful propensities, and, as it were, a depositing of it in the grave, — from which, in this emblem, we come forth as alive from the dead, to walk in newness of life, and at length to enter on the life everlasting."

This is but a sample of the language often used by Baptists.

It may be added in this place, that baptism is emblematical of the candidate's experience, — an act of confession by which his own conscience is obeyed and filled with peace: 1 Peter 3:21. It is fitly administered by regularly-ordained ministers of the gospel; and, though its *validity* does not really depend on the spiritual or ecclesiastical standing of the administrator, it is highly important, for the sake of order, decorum, and a reverent performance of the rite, that the standing of the administrator should be in all respects unexceptionable.

If *necessary,* in order that the baptism of suitable candidates be not omitted, a church may even select one of its lay members to administer the ordinance: but this is *very rarely* necessary. Only in extreme cases would it be wise to deviate thus from the usual order. We may

also remark, that a baptism administered by a clergyman who has never been baptized himself may be valid for the candidate. The ordinance expresses the candidate's entrance upon a new life, — his union with Christ, not with the administrator; and, if it be reverently performed, need not be repeated.

3. *The Subjects of the Rite.*

On this point, Baptists differ more widely from other denominations than on the rite itself; or, rather, the difference between them and others on the former point is more important than the difference on the latter; for they hold that *only believers in Christ are entitled to baptism,* and that *only those who give credible evidence of faith in him should be received to baptism.*

In proof of this, they appeal, —

(1) *To the great commission:* Matt. 28: 19; Mark 16: 16. For it is believed that the verb translated "teach," in the former passage, means to "make disciples by teaching," even as Paul declares that "God was pleased by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe": 1 Cor. 1: 21; and that the consecration by baptism is mentioned afterwards, because it was to be subsequent in fact, — first discipleship in heart, then a public profession of discipleship in baptism.

But this interpretation has been called in question; and it has been said that the participial clauses describe the way in which the duty expressed by the verb "teach" is to be performed: thus, "Go make all the nations disciples, by baptizing and teaching them all things which I have commanded you." That this is not required by the use of language in the New Testament may be seen by consulting the following passages: Matt. 8: 27; 9: 33, 35; 19: 25; 21: 10, 20; 26: 8; also Matt. 17: 14; 19: 3; 22: 16; Luke 6: 35; Matt. 19: 28; also Col. 3: 16; Eph.

5 : 18-21 ; 6 : 17, 18 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 20 ; Acts 20 : 29, 30, 31, 37, 38 ; 22 : 16 ; Joel 1 : 18 sq. ; 1 Cor. 15 : 58 ; 1 Tim. 1 : 12 ; Rom. 15 : 25 ; James 2 : 9 ; Luke 2 : 45 ; Acts 15 : 27 ; Heb. 13 : 13 ; 2 Peter 2 : 5 ; Matt. 19 : 22.[1] And that it is not the meaning which lies on the face of the passage may be proved by the impression which the passage makes on ninety-nine out of a hundred who read it, as well as by the course which the Apostles took in spreading the gospel.[2] Yet if the word translated "teach" be understood to signify "make disciples," and the following participial clauses be understood to set forth in general the way of doing this, it is to be observed, —

a. That no one becomes a "disciple" of another, unless it be by his own preference and choice.

b. That such preference and choice presuppose a knowledge of the Master selected, and a willingness to be taught and trained by him.

c. That baptism would then be the act by which discipleship was formally avowed and openly begun.

d. That it would be an expression of incipient faith in Christ, including a purpose to be guided by him in all things. And

e. That discipleship would be consummated only when the followers of Christ had been taught all things which he commanded.

But this last point suggests the remark that a disciple is a learner, — not one who has learned all which the Master has to teach ; that a person is a disciple *as soon as he accepts one as his teacher and guide.* And this circumstance is almost, or quite, decisive against the interpretation proposed.

(2) *To the practice of the Apostles and their contemporaries:* Acts 2 : 38, 41 ; 8 : 12, 13 ; 9 : 18 ; 10 : 44, 47 ; 16 : 14, 15, 31, 33 ; 18 : 8. There should, it would seem

[1] *Wieberg* and *Ingham,* "On Baptism."

[2] See *Hoffmann* (J. C. K. v.), "Der Schriftbeweis, II., s. 164.

from these portions of the New Testament, be no doubt as to the practice of the Apostles and those acting under their direction. Faith in Christ, with a radical change of heart towards God, preceded baptism. But, if it should be thought by any that the Great Commission, as given by Matthew, embraces both baptism and teaching in the work of making men disciples of Christ, — a view which we reject, — it would still be evident, from the course pursued by the Apostles, that faith in Christ was required in order to baptism. Whatever knowledge must precede a hearty acceptance of Christ as Saviour and Lord must precede baptism and avowed discipleship.

(3) *To apostolic language concerning it:* Rom. 6:3, 4; Gal. 3:27; 1 Peter 3:21. The language of Peter is a veritable *crux interpretum.* He says clearly enough what baptism is not, namely, "a putting away of filth of flesh," the emphasis being on the word "flesh," but more darkly what it is, — *ἀλλά συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν* — translated by Noyes, "The earnest seeking for a good conscience toward God"; by Alford, "The inquiry of a good conscience after God"; by the Bible Union Committee, "The requirement of a good conscience toward God"; and in the common version, "The answer of a good conscience toward God." Tertullian appears to have had this passage in mind when he wrote (De Resur. Carnis): *anima non lavatione, sed responsione sancitur.* "The request of a good conscience" is defensible. But any view of the passage is unfavorable to infant baptism; for infants neither seek nor obey a good conscience in baptism.

(4) *To the usage of the church for upwards of two centuries.* See "Christian Review," Vol. XVI., Dr. Ripley; and Vol. XIX., Dr. Chase; also "Baptist Quarterly," Vol. III., page 168 sq. In these articles it is shown that for more than two hundred years after Christ infant baptism, in the strict sense of the words, was not

practised. The very few passages which have been supposed to assert or imply it are capable of a different interpretation, agreeing with other and clearer texts.

But there are many persons who add to "believers in Christ," *their children,* as proper subjects of baptism.[1] And they rely upon such statements as follow to justify their view:

1. *Baptism under the new covenant takes the place of circumcision under the old.*

Reply. If this were true, it would not follow that the natural offspring of believers should be baptized: for the initiatory rite might belong to natural offspring in one case, and to spiritual in the other; to babes, and to "new-born babes." Being born of the flesh, and being born of the Spirit, may be prerequisite to circumcision and to baptism, respectively. And that this is really so we conclude

(1) From the fact that God established the old covenant with Abraham and his natural seed: Gen. 17: 10-14; but the new covenant with Christ and a spiritual seed: Gal. 3: 7, "They who are of faith, these are the sons of Abraham"; 3: 26, "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus"; 1 Pet. 1: 23, "Being born again, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the word of God, which lives and abides" (Compare Jo. 3: 3-7; 1 Cor. 4: 15; Ja. 1: 18; also Heb. 5: 12-14; 1 Pet. 2: 12: Matt. 11: 25).

(2) From the fact that the subjects of each rite are

[1] See *Wall* (Wm.), "The History of Infant Baptism," etc.; *Gale* (J.), "Reflections on Mr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism," etc.; *Hibbard* (F. G.), "Christian Baptism," "Part First, Infant Baptism"; *Ingham* (R.), "The Theology of the Commission on the Subjects of Baptism," and "Christian Baptism: its Subjects"; *Hodges* (W.), "Baptism tested by Scripture and by History"; *Booth* (A.), "Pedobaptism Examined," etc., Vol. II. of his work on baptism; *Chase* (I.), "Infant Baptism an Invention of Men."

carefully described, and are not the same. See Gen. 17:10 sq.; and Mark 16:16; Acts 8:12. The male children of Jews, and the male servants of Jews, with their male children, were to be circumcised; while believers in Christ, both male and female, Jew and Gentile, were to be baptized.

But, still further, it is evident that baptism did not take the place of circumcision in the apostolic church: —

(3) From the fact that the rite of circumcision was practised by the Jewish Christians, together with baptism, for a considerable period. This is implied in the language of Acts 11:3 f. They that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them"; and of Acts 15:1, "Unless ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved"; (cf. Acts 16:3; 21:20; Gal. 2:12 f.). But a continued observance of circumcision could have had no meaning, if baptism was understood to have taken its place.

(4) From the fact that Paul, when opposing the circumcision of Gentile converts, never hints that baptism takes its place. Says Neander, "The dispute carried on with the Judaizing party on the necessity of circumcision would easily have given an opportunity of introducing this substitute into the controversy, if it had really existed."

2. *Entire households were baptized by the Apostles;* and we must suppose there were infants in some of them: Acts 16:15, 33, 34; 18:8; 1 Cor. 1:16 (cf. 16:15, 17).

Reply. There is no evidence, nor is it probable, that any members of these households were infants or unbelievers. The best modern interpreters have dropped this argument.[1] In "The Design of Baptism with Other Baptismal Tracts for the Times," Dr. Hackett says:

[1] See "Results of the Latest Criticism in Regard to Infant Baptism," by *H. B. Hackett, D.D.*

"The passages of the New Testament, which have been mainly relied on as proving the existence of infant baptism in the time of the Apostles, are Acts 16:15; 18:8, and 1 Cor. 1:16. No decision in Biblical criticism, not absolutely unanimous, can be considered as better established at the present time, than that of the utter insufficiency of these passages to prove, or to justify the practice referred to, as an Apostolic institution."

3. *Christ blessed little children and said, "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven";* and, if infants are saved by Christ, of course they are to be baptized (Mark 10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17; Matt. 19:13-15). It is not as believers in this life that they are saved. As believers after death they need no earthly sanctuaries or ordinances.[1]

4. *Children are said to be holy by virtue of their parents' faith;* hence they must have been baptized (1 Cor. 7:14).

Reply. Paul's argument, on the contrary, seems to prove that the children of believers were not, as such, baptized; for he argues that it is not contaminating for a Christian to live in wedlock with an unbeliever, because it is not contaminating for him to live with his children. There could surely be no force in this to one whose children had all been brought into a covenant relation with God. The heathen companion and the baptized children would not have stood on the same level, would not have been in the same fold; and hence the propriety of associating with the latter could not prove the propriety of doing the same with the former.[2]

5. *The Jews would have made great complaint, if Christianity had not admitted children to baptism.* But we read of no such complaint; hence their infant seed

[1] *Boardman* (G. D.), "The Kingdom," ch. vi., pp. 32-40.

[2] See *Neander, Rückert, Meyer, De Wette, Müller, Hackett,* and others.

were treated as well under the new covenant as under the old.

Reply. The Jews who believed in Christ during the apostolic period continued for the most part to practise circumcision; and evidently regarded Christianity as a separate, additional blessing for those who believed in Christ. The new did not, in the apostolic age, displace the old; the rites of the new did not supersede the rites of the old; hence there could be no reason why Jews, more than others, should insist upon infant baptism. They were too much accustomed to associate particular rites with particular conditions, to be surprised that repentance and faith were made the conditions of baptism. Says Neander, "Among the Jewish Christians, circumcision was held as a seal of the covenant; and hence they had so much the less occasion to make use of another dedication of their children."

6. *The early Church admitted the children of believers to baptism;* hence it must have been an apostolic practice likewise.

Reply. If reference be had to the first two centuries after Christ, the statement is incorrect; if to a later period, it has no force with Baptists, who believe that many erroneous practices began as early as the third century.

It may be added in this place,

(1) That the practice of infant baptism appears to have had its origin in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. So far as history casts any light on this point, the latter preceded the former, and sacramentalism led to child baptism.

(2) That the practice of infant baptism sustains and extends the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. If the theory led to the practice, the practice evermore leads back to the theory, and is empty without it.

(3) That the practice of infant baptism has made the union of church and state possible. Without this prac-

tice, such a union would have been extremely improbable, if not impossible.[1]

4. *The Relation of the Rite to John's Baptism.*

Many writers have taken the position, that Christian baptism is entirely distinct from John's baptism; while others have considered them virtually the same. There is something to be said for the former view, and something also for the latter.

For the former, it is urged, —

(1) *That John the Baptist belonged to the old dispensation, and, therefore, his baptism could not belong to the new.*

There is certainly evidence enough that he belonged to the old economy: Matt. 11 : 11, "the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he"; and it may be that he belonged to the new also. Certainly, both John and Christ passed their lives under the Mosaic law. But John lived to point men to Christ, the Lamb of God; and his work had respect to the introduction of the new era rather than to the filling out of the old. It is, therefore, by no means certain that his relation to Judaism forbade him to introduce, by divine authority, an ordinance which belonged to Christianity.

(2) *That he could not have administered baptism into the name of the Trinity.*

Perhaps not; certainly he could not have used the formula which has been generally used by Christians; for this formula presupposes a fuller knowledge of the gospel than can be reasonably attributed to him. But if his words in baptizing were an epitome of his preaching, they must have implied allegiance to the Christ and the Spirit, as well as to the Father; for Luke testifies expressly, that he "evangelized" the people (ch. 3 : 18);

[1] *Hovey* (A.), "Evils of Infant Baptism," p. 41 sq.

and John bears witness to nearly the same thing: John 1:29 sq. 36; 3:25 sq., as well as Paul: Acts 19:4.

(3) *That baptism was sometimes repeated when the followers of John embraced Christianity, as preached by the Apostles after the day of Pentecost* (Acts 19:1 sq.). In the only instance of the kind recorded, "the disciples" had never heard "whether there is a Holy Spirit"; and it is therefore difficult to believe that they had been baptized by John himself; for John had taught his disciples to believe in him that should come after him, and described Jesus as one who should baptize them in the Holy Spirit. This appears to have been an important feature of his preaching; and therefore it is fair to presume that the disciples in question had not been taught and baptized by him. They had probably been baptized, without suitable instruction, by some unenlightened follower of John; and hence their baptism had no reference to Jesus as the Christ or to the Holy Spirit.

But, on the other hand, it may be said

a. *That the ritual act was in both cases the same, representing the same inward change:* Matt. 3:6 sq.; Mark 1:4 sq.; Luke 3:3 sq.; 7:30; 20:3 sq. (cf. the senior Edwards, I., p. 163).

b. *That repentance towards God, and faith in the Messiah, as the Giver of the Holy Spirit, were required in both cases:* Matt. 3:11 sq.; Mark 1:7 sq.; Luke 3:15 sq.; John 1:27 sq.; Acts 19:4. It will be evident to those who study closely all the passages bearing on this point, that John invited none but renewed persons to his baptism. For (a) Repentance — *μετάνοια* — is a change of mind and heart, implying faith and love. By it one enters upon a new spiritual life. But was not the baptism which he administered *unto* or *into* repentance, — that is, a rite by which an impenitent man *pledged* himself to repent? Such a rite would have been absurd; for no impenitent man can give a satisfactory pledge of repentance

in the future. It is a *present* duty; and a refusal to do it now vitiates every promise to do it by and by. (b) Both Mark and Luke say that John came preaching "a baptism of repentance *unto the remission of sins*": Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; and the sins of unregenerate men cannot be forgiven. His baptism symbolized the beginning of a new spiritual life, to which those who received it devoted themselves. (c) Both Matthew and Mark testify that "confession of their sins" was made by those who were baptized by John: Matt. 3:6; Mark 1:5; doubtless, then, it was required by him as one of the clearest evidences of a new heart. Men do not readily make public confession of "their sins," while still foes to God. (d) "Fruits meet for repentance," or rather, "worthy of repentance," were required of some: Matt. 3:6-12; Luke 3:7-14; and both from the expression itself and from the use made of it by Paul: Acts 26:20, we know that it refers to fruits which reveal a penitent or changed mind, rather than those which will lead to it. The passages referred to above give ample proof that John accompanied the requirement of repentance with that of a readiness to welcome the Messiah, who should baptize in the Holy Spirit.

c. *That baptism was not repeated when the followers of John became disciples of Christ.* Some suppose that many of the three thousand who were added to the church on the day of Pentecost had been disciples of John; but, if so, there is no evidence of their re-baptism; if so, there is no evidence of their being regarded as for the first time believers.

They were probably said to be added, because now they were fully convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus, and were at last ready to avow themselves his followers. There is no proof to be found in the New Testament, that those baptized by John were commonly re-baptized when they connected themselves with Christians. In

Acts 18: 24-28, the story of Apollos is told. He knew only the baptism of John; but there is no hint of his receiving Christian baptism. Aquila and Priscilla taught him the way of the Lord more perfectly, and that is all. "In *every instance,* unless this be an exception, where the case of an individual is mentioned in the Acts, as in a state requiring baptism, this rite is administered, and prominent notice taken of it in the narrative." Apollos was not baptized, because John's baptism was virtually Christian baptism.

d. *That the Apostles themselves were, it is probable, baptized only with John's baptism.* This seems to be a natural inference from the narrative in the first chapter of John, verses 35-49; at least so far as those were concerned who had been baptized by the harbinger of Christ. If any of the twelve had not been immersed by John, they were doubtless introduced into the fellowship of the earlier apostles by the rite of baptism. See John 4: 1, 2. It is likewise to be noted, that Jesus himself submitted to John's baptism.[1]

e. *That the new dispensation is represented as beginning with the work of John:* Luke 16: 16; Acts 10: 36, 37; John 1: 22 sq. The first of these texts reads thus: "The law and the prophets (were), until John — *μέχρι Ἰωάννου*; since then the kingdom of God is preached, and every one presseth forcefully into it." Meyer says, "Since then (already by John himself) the good news of the Messiah's kingdom has entered, and with what result! *Every one presses with force into it.*" This is the obvious meaning of the words.

The reasons for believing that Christian baptism began with that of John, and became more significant only as the truths which it represented were more fully revealed, seem then to be stronger than those which are supposed to show an essential difference between the two.

[1] *Turretin,* Loc. iii., Qu. xvi., p. 340 sq.

The Lord's Supper

In this case it is proper to consider the external rite, the import of the rite, and the proper communicants.

1. *The external rite.*

The institution of this rite by our Saviour has been described by four of the sacred writers, namely, Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19, 20; and Paul, 1 Cor. 11:23-25. From these several accounts, we learn the following facts in respect to the *elements* employed in this rite, and the *way* in which they were used: —

(1) *The elements were bread and wine.* The bread was doubtless *unleavened;* yet this peculiarity is nowhere referred to by Christ himself or by the sacred writers, unless in 1 Cor. 5:7, 8; and hence is not to be looked upon as significant. The wine is spoken of by Christ as "this fruit of the vine": Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; and it seems very desirable to make use of the same at the present day, diluted, as was then customary, with water.

(2) The *ritual use* of these elements embraced a. the eucharistic prayers; b. the breaking of the bread and giving of the wine by the presiding officer; and c. the eating and drinking of the respective elements by all the communicants.

We do not suppose that the *singing* or *chanting* of Christ and his disciples, just before they went out into the Mount of Olives, was intended to be a part of the new ordinance; for it is mentioned by neither Luke nor Paul in describing the institution of the Lord's Supper, and we do not find it anywhere enjoined as a part of this ordinance. The words sung by Christ and his disciples were probably the second part of the great Hallel, — namely, Psalms, 115, 118, — which the Jews were in the habit of singing after they had eaten the paschal lamb. It is, however, eminently proper to praise the Lord in song after partaking of the emblems of his death.

It has been conjectured, that, in the age of the Apostles, the eucharistic prayers were offered by the whole body of the church in concert; but there is no sufficient reason for this conjecture. The language of Paul: 1 Cor. 10:16, "the cup of blessing which we bless," would be perfectly natural, if all the members of the church were supposed to join in the prayers offered by the pastor, — a fact which they were accustomed to signify by saying "Amen" at the close. Notice the next clause, "the loaf which we break": did the whole church break the loaf in common? If so, it must have been by carrying round the loaf and letting each communicant break off a piece.

2. *The import of the Lord's supper.*

Since the elements represent the body and blood of the dying Saviour, the reception of them, —

(1) *Symbolizes* the reception by faith of Christ crucified as the source and support of spiritual and eternal life: 1 Cor. 10:16; cf. John 6:51, 53, 54. This implies, of course, a belief in the doctrine of the atonement. To believe in Christ *crucified* as the perpetual source of life is to believe in the atonement as that source. It implies also union with the spiritual body of Christ, by virtue of receiving him. This is a subordinate but important fact represented by the joint partaking of the supper. It is the act of a family: 1 Cor. 10:15-21.

(2) *Commemorates* the atoning death of Christ, or Christ as the Lamb of God offering himself in sacrifice for sin: 1 Cor. 11:24, 26; 5:7. This office of the Lord's Supper, it will be noticed, was very emphatically declared by the Saviour, "Do this in remembrance of me": 1 Cor. 11:25, 26. Indeed, the commemorative import of this rite makes its symbolical meaning doubly impressive. That the *emblems* are also *memorials,* bringing the scenes of Calvary distinctly before the mind, adds greatly to their power in sustaining faith and love.

(3) *Typifies* the marriage supper of the Lamb, or, in other words, the future blessedness of believers in the presence of Christ: Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; 1 Cor. 11:26; cf. Matt. 22:2 sq.; 25:10; Rev. 19:7-9. Some theologians have doubted whether the Lord's Supper is really typical of heavenly fellowship and joy; but the passages referred to are sufficient evidence that it is.

a. It appears from several passages that the paschal lamb was, in some sense, a type, not of the Lord's Supper, but of Christ himself: 1 Cor. 5:7; John 19:36; (cf. Ex. 12:46; and Num. 9:12). But, if the paschal lamb bore some resemblance to Christ, the paschal supper must naturally have borne some resemblance to the Lord's Supper. The former, in fact, commemorated the deliverance of the natural Israel from temporal ruin; while the latter commemorates the deliverance of the spiritual Israel from eternal ruin. As the Jewish people typified the true Israel, so likewise did many Jewish rites foreshadow Christian *realities,* but *not* Christian rites. The Passover was not a type of the Lord's Supper — the type of a symbol.

b. Breaking the bread and pouring out the wine are suggestive parts of the ordinance; for they increase its commemorative power by bringing the death of Christ more vividly to mind. This is lost by the Roman Catholic form.

c. The papal custom of withholding the cup from laymen is not really authorized by the Word of God; though several expressions in the New Testament are appealed to as furnishing, at least by implication, this authority. For example, Acts 2:42; 20:7, 11; 1 Cor. 11:27-29; but cf. 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, 21.

d. The papal doctrines of *transubstantiation,* and sacrifice of the mass are unscriptural. See Heb. 7:27; 9:26, 28; 10:10 (cf. Mal. 1:11) for conclusive proof of this remark.

For the doctrine, see "Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini," p. 66, i:

"Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento *contineri vere, realiter* et *substantialiter corpus* et *sanguinem una cum* ANIMA *et* DIVINITATE Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum; sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in signo vel figura aut virtute: anathema sit." "If any one denies that in the sacrament of the most holy eucharist both the body and the blood together with the SOUL and DIVINITY of our Lord Jesus Christ and hence, the whole Christ, are *truly, really,* and *substantially* contained; but says that He is in it, as in a sign or figure, or virtually: let him be accursed."

Yet Christ says expressly of one of the elements which he had consecrated, "I will no more *drink* of this *fruit* of the *vine,*" etc. Thus he recognized what he gave them in the cup as "this fruit of the vine," and, of course, as merely a *symbol* of his blood, since he was still alive in their presence; but not as his *real* blood.

e. The Lutheran doctrine of *consubstantiation* is exceedingly unnatural, and no more scriptural than the papal doctrine. Could the disciples have supposed the real body and blood of Christ present in the elements, bread and wine, which they received from him? It does not seem possible. Yet the Augsburg Confession says:

"Lutherans teach concerning the Lord's Supper, that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those partaking at the Lord's Supper, and they disapprove those who teach otherwise" (A. D. 1530), and the Formula of Concord says, "We believe that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are verily and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken along with the bread and wine" (A. D. 1579).

f. The view which regards the elements as merely emblems of the body and blood of Christ rests upon a simple and obvious interpretation of this language.

See John 14:6; 15:5; Luke 12:1; Heb. 10:20; Philem. 12, and Gen. 41:26; Ex. 12:11.[1]

g. The New Testament nowhere prescribes *when* or *how often* this ordinance is to be observed. It was, however, in all probability, observed more frequently in the apostolic church than it is by Christians at the present day. Whether a more frequent observance of this rite is now desirable can only be determined by careful observation.

3. *The proper communicants.*

For the sake of treating this topic in a practical way, we offer the following questions and replies, namely: —[2]

(1) *Should any except credible believers in Christ be invited to the Lord's Supper?*

Replying in the negative, we appeal: —

a. *To the import of the ordinance itself.* It is partly commemorative, "This do in remembrance of me." It is a memorial of the dying Redeemer. But those who have no true faith in Christ, who are at heart self-righteous, who reject his proffered aid, cannot properly commemorate his death. Again, it is partly symbolical, "Take, eat; this is my body which is for you": 1 Cor. 11:24. The act of eating and drinking the consecrated elements is made prominent; and by it the communicants signify their reception of Christ as the support of their spiritual life. How, then, can any person who rejects the Saviour wish or dare to approach his table? Or how can one who gives no satisfactory evidence of faith in Christ, or fellowship with him, be invited to his table?

[1] See "Bib. Sacra" I., p. 245 sq. and *Hovey* (A.), "The Holy Supper in History and Scripture."

[2] *Arnold* (A. N.), "Prerequisites to Communion," 1860; *Hovey* (A.), "Close Communion" and "The Holy Supper," Am. Bp. Pub. Society; *Litton* (G.), "Church of Christ," p. 64. *Edwards* (J. Sen.), "On the Qualifications for Full Communion"; *Pepper* (G. D. B.), "Open Communion," Bap. Quart., Vol. I.; *Hall* (R.), "Terms of Communion."

b. *To the example of the apostolic churches.* So far as this point is concerned, their practice seems to have been uniform. The sacred emblems were never offered to unbelievers. But is the example of churches under apostolic guidance of any weight in the present case? We believe it is; for when Paul declares, with reference to a practice far less closely connected with the gospel than this, "We have no such custom, neither, the churches of God," he appears to regard this fact as a valid argument against it. Moreover, the practice now in question must have been established by the Apostles; for they received the ordinance from Christ, and caused it to be observed in the primitive church.

c. *To the caution which Paul gave to the Corinthians.* "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup," — words which imply the need of special preparation for the ordinance. Whoever does not appreciate the sacrifice of Christ, and does not recognize his need of it as an atonement for sin, is unprepared for the Lord's Supper. If he partake, it will be unworthily, if he discern not the body. "He will eat and drink judgment to himself": 1 Cor. 11: 27-29.

(2) *Should any except baptized believers be invited to the Lord's Supper?* We reply in the negative, and justify our answer by an appeal: —

a. *To the relation of the two ordinances to each other as symbols.* Baptism symbolizes the beginning of the new life; and the Lord's Supper, its nourishment. The former represents a change from one spiritual condition into another, — putting off the old, and putting on the new, — death and resurrection; while the latter represents growth, — progress in a present condition. The one sets forth a single event; the other, an ever-recurring duty and refreshment.

As the life of faith must be originated before it can be nourished, so an ordinance which represents the incep-

tion of this life must naturally precede one which represents its existence and support. In baptism, the sinner publicly declares his allegiance to Christ; at the Lord's table, he takes his place among the acknowledged friends of Jesus, and receives from him tokens of love and favor. By baptism he is formally qualified for the duties and privileges of citizenship; by the Lord's Supper, he is formally recognized and honored as a citizen.

b. *To the practice of Christian churches in the apostolic age.* We find no hint in the sacred record of the presence of unbaptized persons at the Lord's table; but we do find that baptism was treated as the first great duty to be done after exercising faith, and that the eucharist, when noticed at all, is assigned to those who were already baptized. In no case is the Lord's Supper put before baptism; in no case are believers brought into the church, and afterwards baptized.

But to this it has been objected (*e. g.* by Robert Hall), that some of the Eleven who were present at the institution of the Supper had not been baptized; and that none of them had received Christian baptism. In reply it may be said (a) that John's baptism was substantially the same as Christian; (b) that several of the Eleven had presumably been baptized by John prior to their connection with Jesus; (c) that all of them had probably been thus baptized, for John was sent expressly to prepare the way of the Lord; and, in default of evidence to the contrary, it may be presumed that men whose hearts had been prepared by his preaching were selected by our Saviour to be his personal attendants. Besides, the promptness with which they left all, and followed Christ, is favorable to this view. (d) That Jesus, by the hands of his disciples, baptized others who believed in him; and, if it was his custom to have his followers baptized, it may be taken for granted that he did not make the case of the twelve an exception. He was, moreover,

himself baptized, — a fact which strengthens our conviction that his chosen were also baptized.

(3) *Should any but those whose church-walk is orderly be invited to the Lord's Supper?* No persons, we reply, but those who are members of some Christian church, whose deportment agrees with the gospel of Christ, and who strive together for the faith of the gospel, should be invited to the communion. In support of this position, we remark, —

a. *That becoming connected with a Christian church naturally precedes partaking of the eucharist.* By baptism, one avows himself a servant and soldier of Christ. But the army of Christ is made up of different companies, — one here, another there; and a man can have no regular connection with it, unless he joins one of these companies, or, in other words, a particular church. Uniting with a local church is therefore the natural sequence or counterpart of the baptismal vow. Hence, baptism is often called the door into the church; and membership is supposed to follow it as a matter of course. Ordinarily it should do so, and thus precede admission to the Lord's Supper. The latter is to be repeated till the close of life; while the former, — uniting with a Christian church, — is, like baptism, an act to be performed but once, unless a repetition is made necessary by local changes.

b. *That the Lord's Supper is a church rite, and should therefore, be restricted to church members in good standing.* It was evidently meant to be observed, not by individual Christians at will, nor by irresponsible companies of believers, but by the churches of Christ as such.

This view is justified by the language of Paul to the Corinthians: 1 Cor. 10:16, 17; 11:18-34. Several points are fixed by these words of the Apostle; for example: —

(a) The Corinthian Christians were evidently accus-

tomed to meet together to observe the Lord's Supper. No less than four times, within the space of a few verses, does Paul connect their coming together in one place with the celebration of the eucharist. To do this seems to have been the avowed and principal object of their assembling.

(b) They could not properly observe it without coming together. This is implied. Many things could be done by Christians separately and at home. "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" "If any man is hungry, let him eat at home"; but it does not seem to have entered the Apostle's mind that the Lord's Supper could be eaten at home.

(c) They came together "in church," to observe the Lord's Supper. When Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians, the word ἐκκλησίᾳ had already become the appropriate designation of an organized body of Christians; and, in the passage before us, it must be used in this sense, — a sense which it generally has in this epistle. Hence the words ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ signify "in church form or capacity," and show that the Corinthian believers celebrated the eucharist as a church.

In no other instance has an inspired writer spoken at length of the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper in the apostolic churches. If the New Testament anywhere shows with sufficient clearness the practice of those churches which were planted and trained by the Apostles, it is in this letter; and, in this letter, the ordinance is represented as observed by the church as such.

(d) Looking back from this, the fullest account of the eucharist in the New Testament, we find a brief reference to it in Acts 20:7: "And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread," etc. That there were disciples in Troas is not denied; and that they were a regular church is commonly admitted. See Acts 16:8; 2 Cor. 2:12, 13 (cf. Acts 14:23; Tit. 1:5).

(e) Going back still further, we find another record in Acts 2:41, 42. The Christians here spoken of were already baptized; they were under the guidance and teaching of the Apostles; they met together almost daily for social worship; they provided for their poor with great liberality; and they were living in the same city. Hence they were virtually, if not formally, a Christian church. If not, when did they become such a body?

Later on in the Acts, they are habitually spoken of as "the church at Jerusalem," yet with no account of their formal organization.

But it may be said, they did not meet together and observe the Lord's Supper as a church; for they are described as "breaking bread from house to house." In reply, it may be remarked, that the circumstances of the church at Jerusalem were peculiar. The disciples of Jesus could use neither temple nor synagogue for any service distinctively Christian. Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Bengel, and others, think that κατ' οἶκον means a private house, or a house of their own, as distinguished from the temple.

But even if they had no house large enough to receive them all, and therefore met in several places to break bread, — one or two of the Apostles presiding over each assembly, — this provisional arrangement would not have caused the Holy Supper to be esteemed a family or social rite; for only those who had been baptized, and were walking together in the faith, partook of it. The emblems were not carried out of the church as an associated body of believers, nor were they used at pleasure by families, or groups of brethren.

(f) Finally, we come to the institution of the Supper by our Saviour himself. There were doubtless many Christians in Jerusalem at the Passover when the Supper was instituted; but they were in no proper sense a church, — a distinct responsible body, — called out from

the rest of the nation, and acting together as the servants of Christ. "For the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, which expresses the idea of evoking, calling out, expresses also the idea of convoking, calling together, and is, therefore, most applicable to a Christian church as a select, organized body, called out by direct choice from the mass of men, and called together by divine authority as a spiritual corporation." (Alexander.) On the other hand, the little band of disciples to whom the Supper was first administered was essentially such a body. They had been summoned to his side by the Saviour, were his recognized and constant followers, were under his instruction, were the champions of his cause, had a common purse and treasurer, were united in belief and action, and, in a word, were a responsible community, separated from the world, and associated together in the service of Christ.

(g) It is also to be observed, that when we read of the baptism of single individuals, or even of households, — as of Paul, of the Ethiopian eunuch, of Lydia, of the Philippian jailer, and of Crispus at Corinth, — there is never any allusion to the Lord's Supper as following the baptism; but, when great numbers were baptized on the day of Pentecost, there sometimes is a reference to the Supper as presently observed.

(h) That this ordinance appears to have been restricted by the early Christians to church members. Says Justin Martyr,[1] "This food is called among us *εὐχαριστία*, of which no one is allowed to partake who does not believe that what we teach is true, and has not been bathed the bath for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and does not live as Christ has enjoined." Three prerequisites are here laid down, — faith, baptism, and an orderly walk; and there is abundant evidence that these were insisted upon by Christians of every name

[1] "First Apology," ch. 66 (A. D. 138-9).

for a long time. The Didache also makes baptism prerequisite to partaking of the Lord's Supper.

As the eucharist is a church ordinance, Baptists generally hold that none but members of the church observing it are strictly entitled to partake; and that none can properly be invited to join with them who could not be welcomed, without change of views, to full membership. They also hold that those who are giving, and are pledged to give, the weight of their influence against what is believed to be essential to Christian obedience, cannot properly be received into its fellowship. If admitted, they would sow dissension, and thus prove themselves "heretics" in the primitive sense of the term.

But members of Pedobaptist churches steadily affirm and teach by their ecclesiastical position, that infant sprinkling is, in effect, Christian baptism; or else that baptism is not prerequisite to full membership and an orderly walk in a Christian church. In either case they throw the whole weight of their example against the practice of Christian baptism, — a practice which, in the judgment of Baptists, is essential to Christian obedience. How, then, can their church-walk be indorsed as orderly? If the members of a Baptist church were, in some other way, to act as decisively against this doctrine and practice, they would justly be esteemed by their brethren subverters of the truth, and originators of division. See Rom. 16: 17; and cf. Titus 3: 10; Gal. 5: 12; 1 Cor. 1: 10.

But if a Baptist church ought to withdraw the hand of fellowship from members who set themselves firmly against the duty of obeying a plain command of Christ, it surely has no right to offer this hand to such persons when united to another church, or to any persons who persistently assail the duty in question. If communion at the Lord's table were the sign of Christian fellowship merely, the case would be different; but such a sign

it can never be while, besides faith, baptism and an orderly church-walk are the scriptural terms of admission to the Lord's Supper.

It may now be remarked, that Baptists heartily acknowledge both the duty and the privilege of Christian fellowship with all who love the Lord, and approve of denominational coöperation if, and so far as, it requires no one to disregard his convictions as to the paramount claims of Christ. To "love the truth and peace" is their watchword (Zech. 8: 19).

III. Effect of Church Life

The power of church life may be discovered in the spirit of obedience to Christ which it cultivates; in the practice of social worship which it maintains; in the increase of Christian knowledge which it secures; in the watchfulness and consistency which it promotes; in the labor for others which it organizes and stimulates. We must give attention to each of these points.

1. *It cultivates a spirit of obedience to Christ.* For it requires, at the outset, a solemn act of obedience, — a public profession of faith in Christ, and allegiance to him. No act in a Christian's life is adapted to fill his mind with greater awe and thankfulness than that of being buried with Christ in baptism. It is an act never to be repeated, deliberate, irreversible; and, by its very solitariness, it lays hold of his imagination, and repeats its lesson again and again to the close of life. Besides, there is self-denial in it; the offence of the cross has not ceased; and, if it clings to one act of obedience more than to others, that act is baptism. Perhaps this was intended by the Saviour as one check to a rash profession of faith.

In a less marked degree, church life is, from first to last, a school of obedience. It must be continued when

the affections languish, when doubt creeps into the heart, when courage wanes, because it is commanded. It must be persisted in against the opposition and contempt of the world, because it is commanded. And, by this obedience, it cultivates an open, manly spirit, — the heroic virtues; for, in church life, the Christian has his place apart from the world, under the banner of his Lord; and, after a time, obedience becomes easy.

2. *It maintains the practice of social worship.* And, by social worship, we mean all worship in connection with others. It will then be in place to speak briefly of the duty and benefits of social worship.

This form of worship promotes growth in grace: —

(1) By enkindling higher devotion to God in the heart. We are beings of sympathy, easily affected by the feelings of those around us. Hence religious emotion is increased by contact with religious emotion.

(2) By bringing into livelier exercise brotherly love. "The sight of the eye affects the heart." We do not often feel a very deep love for those who are strangers to us. As a rule, we love our fellow-Christians, as such, in proportion to our knowledge of their Christian life and experience.

(3) By securing a special blessing from God. "If two of you shall agree on earth concerning any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them by my Father who is in heaven; for, where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them": Matt. 18: 19, 20. United prayer and worship entitle us to expect signal favors from God through Christ.

It is not, indeed, easy to overstate the spiritual benefits of social and public worship to believers; yet for this they are indebted to the Christian church. It preserves multitudes from apostasy; it stimulates multitudes to higher activity; it unites the moral life and force of

many persons; it augments their faith, love, hope, zeal, and thereby the efficiency of their prayer.

3. *It secures an increase of Christian knowledge.* This it does by the regular preaching of the gospel, which it supports; by the study of God's word, which this preaching induces; by the vivid representation of Christian truth, — central, vital truth, in the ordinances.

4. *It promotes, by its discipline, watchfulness and consistency.* Many a Christian has been saved from apostasy by the consciousness of being under the eye of the church, and liable to its discipline; and many a one has, doubtless, like the incestuous man at Corinth, been led to repentance by solemn exclusion from the church.

5. *It organizes and stimulates labor for the good of others.* This is a great end of church life. Thus associated, Christians can act with more success in diffusing the gospel and saving men; and the more effectually they are able to labor, the more earnestly will they do so. Success stimulates effort; numbers do the same. There is, or should be, in every church, a kind of *esprit de corps* which excites a degree of enthusiasm in the several members, animating them to greater boldness and activity. But seeking a high and holy object, as the honor of Christ and the salvation of men, is always beneficial to the moral nature of him who seeks it. Hence church life tends to sanctify the believer's heart; to render him more unselfish, hopeful, magnanimous. And it is well to remember that the conscious motive of Paul in preaching Christ to the Gentiles, was not his desire for his own growth in grace, but rather his love of Christ and of mankind. He wished to save men, and the love of Christ constrained him to preach to them the gospel. Churches are constituted for the same purpose. Their highest function is to bring men to Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord. The order, the ritual, the worship, the co-

öperation of church members are sacred, because they contribute to the honor and sway of the Name that is above every name, and the highest encomium which can be paid to Christian churches is that they enable their members to do more than they otherwise could for the evangelization of the world.

CHAPTER IV

THE LORD'S DAY[1]

I. The Duty of Keeping the Lord's Day

OF the several theories maintained by Christians as to the Lord's day, the following deserve particular notice: —

1. That men are under no obligation to keep it by abstaining from secular toil; either because reason and Paul unite in declaring that all days are alike, — a view which we need not pause to refute, or because the fourth commandment of the decalogue and the original appointment of the Sabbath require all men to keep the seventh day of the week holy, — a view which is inconsistent with the language of Paul in Col. 2:16; Gal. 4:9, 10; and Rom. 14:5; with the testimony of Christian writers, like Justin Martyr, as to the practice of the early churches; and with the principle laid down by Christ, that the Sabbath was made for man, — that is, for his highest good.

2. That by the authority of Christ, the first day of the week has been substituted for the seventh, — the day being changed, but the command to observe it by abstaining from all secular labor remaining in full force. The defenders of this theory insist that the decalogue is bind-

[1] *Hessey* (J. A.), "Sunday," etc., 4th ed. 1880; *Gilfillan* (J.), "The Sabbath," etc.; *Cox* (R.), "The Literature of the Sabbath Question"; *Waffle* (A. E.), "The Lord's Day"; *Salmond* (C. (A.), "The Sabbath"; *Hengstenberg* (W.), "The Lord's Day," Eng. trans., 1853; *Schaff-Herzog,* art. "Sunday"; "Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th ed., art. "Sunday."

ing on Christians, from the first command to the last, though God has seen fit to ordain that the Lord's day shall take the place of the Jewish Sabbath. This theory has prevailed extensively in England, Scotland, and the United States; and a great deal may be justly said in its favor.

Yet it does not seem to be entirely consistent with the language of Paul in the passages cited above, with the views of fair-minded Christian writers in the early church, or with the general character of the new dispensation. It appears to emphasize unduly the legal side of the question, attaching more importance to the fourth commandment of the decalogue, as directly applicable to the Lord's day, than is altogether safe. The adherents of this view are careful to call the Lord's day the Christian Sabbath, — a designation which is never given to it in the New Testament, or by any Christian writer of the first three centuries.

3. That the duty of keeping the Lord's day rests entirely on the practice and authority of the church. Many who accept this theory believe that the practice began in the days of the Apostles; but they do not admit that this circumstance is of decisive importance. They may be divided into two classes; namely, those who concede to the church authority in such matters, and those who are willing to comply, in some measure, with a good and useful custom.

This theory overlooks the real grounds of Christian obligation in this matter, and tends to great laxity in observing the Lord's day. Where it prevails, recreation, if not business, will be sure to encroach upon the proper use of the day, as a period for religious worship and instruction, and thus defeat the chief end of its appointment.

4. That the duty of consecrating the Lord's day to religious uses rests upon THE AUTHORITATIVE EXAMPLE

OF THE APOSTLES: Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10; Heb. 10:25.

Confirmed (1) *by the practice of the early churches* (see the works quoted *supra*).

(2) *By the Sabbath-keeping enjoined on the children of Israel:* Ex. 20:8 sq.

(3) *By the original sanctification of the seventh day:* Gen. 2:2, 3; *and*

(4) *By the words of Christ, affirming that the Sabbath was made for man:* Mark 2:27.

The practice of the early churches tends to establish very firmly the distinction between the Lord's day and the Jewish Sabbath. The fourth command of the decalogue proves that the Israelites needed to have one day in seven set apart from secular toil to religious service; the primeval institution of the Sabbath shows that it was meant for all mankind; and the reason of its existence, declared by Christ, fully accounts for the change from the last day of the week to the first, made by the Apostles. For, since the resurrection of Christ, the first day of the week takes precedence of every other in religious interest, and it is practically impossible for Christians to feel as deep an interest in the finishing of the work of creation as they do in the finishing of the work of atonement.

It should be borne in mind, that when God rested from creating, — a kind of secular work, — he entered at once on the moral and religious training of man; so that Jesus could say, "My Father worketh until now, and I work": John 5:17; that is, even on the Sabbath, and perhaps, especially on the Sabbath. But this primeval training was carried forward, chiefly, by means of the light which shines from creation, — a light which has proved insufficient for fallen man. Not the knowledge of creation, but the knowledge of redemption, provided by God, is what sinful man most needs. Hence the day which commemorates a completed atonement, ready to be applied by

the gospel and grace of Christ, is the day of divinest significance and greatest spiritual influence for sinful men.

This theory is in perfect accord with the doctrine of Paul, and with the character of the new dispensation. It recognizes the very important bearing of the primeval and Jewish Sabbath on the question of keeping the Lord's day; and it assigns a proper place to the inspired guidance of the churches by the Apostles.

II. The Manner of Keeping the Lord's Day

It has been shown above, that it is the duty of Christians to consecrate the day to religious uses. But how strictly? Must they be governed by the same rules as were the Jews in abstaining from every kind of secular toil? Or have they greater freedom in this respect? It must doubtless be conceded that much is left to their own judgment and conscience, to their love of Christ and desire to win men to his service. But with the general duty made plain, and with the law of love written upon their hearts, it is to be presumed that they will keep the day very much as Christ kept the Jewish Sabbath, finding no occasion for secular business or idle self-indulgence. Hence, it may be remarked that their employments on the Lord's day should be: —

1. *Those which are either embraced in religious service, or are immediately prerequisite to it.* By religious service is meant not only worship in the sanctuary, or elsewhere, but all labor for the salvation of men.

2. *Those which are evidently necessary for the preservation of life and health.* A tender Christian conscience will guide one to the right application of this general rule, especially, with the aid of Christ's example.

3. *Those which are required to prevent or to relieve severe suffering in man or beast.* Particular applica-

tions of this rule must also be left to the enlightened conscience. If it is honestly accepted, and interpreted in the light of the Saviour's conduct, few mistakes will be made.

The idea of rest was more predominant in the Jewish law than it should be in Christian practice; for spiritual joy and activity are characteristic of the followers of Christ. Their religion is not conservative, chiefly, but aggressive; it should go forth with joyful step, conquering and to conquer.

In saying that it is the duty of Christians to keep the Lord's day in the manner specified, it is meant that all who have a knowledge of the Christian religion ought to do this; but it is not meant that some may compel others to do it. As to the Lord's day as a civil institution, something will be said in "Christian Ethics"; but, in this place, reference is made solely to the personal obligation of every man to do the will of God in this respect.

Returning to a consideration of the end or object of the Lord's day, we are called to a study of the relation of the day to Christian life, and especially to that life as one of service to mankind.

(1) The saying of Jesus, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" furnishes our starting point for a study of the Lord's day as a blessing to Christians. Divisions of time are of no value to God; they are only valuable to mankind as means of improvement. Looked at as a section of time, one day of the week is the peer of another, and no day is precious, except as it provides an opportunity for increase of good in moral things.

(2) Hence the words of Paul, "One man esteems one day above another, another esteems every day alike. Let each one be fully persuaded in his own mind," are in place here. A clear conscience is better in the sight of God than any recognition or non-recognition of particular

times and seasons. These are sacred to God when, and only when, they are helps to men in Christian service.

(3) But there are many ways of serving God, some of which require, while others do not, set times and well-concerted action. Social worship must be occasional, because private duties claim a larger part of everyone's time. Farming and manufacturing and building are necessary to the welfare of society. Children must be fed and clad and taught, and with a majority of mankind a great part of life must be given to the care of the body.

(4) Yet the body is not all, and its claims must not silence those of the spirit. If the days of one's life are to bear the choicest fruits in character and influence, some of them must be set apart to religious work. For order is heaven's law, and the soul will not have its opportunity, as well as the body, unless time is afforded it. Its claims should be accounted more exigent than those of the body, and fixed periods allotted to a fulfilment of them. If one day in seven is recognized as the *minimum* of time which ought to be consecrated to spiritual service, secular cares should not be suffered to encroach upon it. This we are able to say from our knowledge of the human mind, without appealing to the word of God.

(5) Slow, indeed, would be the progress of the soul in knowledge and piety, if its claims were forgotten six days out of seven. But this is not supposed to be the case. Religion is to pervade the whole life. Every kind of work is to be ennobled by it. But one day in seven is to be filled with religious activities. Study, meditation, prayer, social worship, and, above all, systematic coöperative labor for the religious life of the world, are to give new tone and energy to personal faith on the Lord's day, and through the concentrated work of that day to carry the leaven of godliness into every other day of the week.

(6) But the relation of the Lord's day to Christian life becomes most evident when we study Christianity as an aggressive religion, when we look upon believers as uniting together for the evangelization of all mankind. An enterprise so vast, requiring the wisest coöperation, the most strategical, persistent, and heroic use of all the powers of Christendom, cannot be achieved without united prayer and consultation. The intelligence and enthusiasm of believers cannot be sustained without regular seasons of worship. The rushing torrents of worldliness cannot be arrested without the help of social worship. And wise plans of coöperation cannot be formed without time for consultation. All these are provided for in the Lord's day.

(7) It is a joyful day. It commemorates the victory of Christ over death and the grave. It is prophetic of conquest, — until every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Such a day should be full to overflowing of inspiration to missionary service. It should be a trumpet call to every timid believer to gird on his armor and place himself in the ranks, ready to assail the powers of darkness which have so long ruled the world. It should remind the wavering disciple of the last order issued by his Risen Lord before going up on high: "All authority was given to me in heaven and on earth. Go, therefore, and disciple all the nations, baptizing them unto the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatever I commanded you: and, behold, I am with you all the days unto the consummation of the age."

(8) The Lord's day is first of all intended to serve the religious nature of Christians, and, through them, that of all mankind; for to all mankind they are to preach the gospel. But while its supreme mission is to the souls of men, it is a benefactor of their bodies also. The rest

from customary labor which it brings is undoubtedly favorable to bodily vigor and endurance. For body and soul are closely united. Whatever benefits one of them benefits, as a rule, the other also. Changing one's course of thought for a day every week is certainly conducive to health and happiness, as well as to largeness of mind. Nevertheless, the great reason for the Lord's day is moral and religious, and, much as we may emphasize the duty of resting from ordinary labor on that day, we should insist far more strongly on the duty of making it a holy day, rather than a holiday.

CHAPTER V

PERIOD OF GROWTH AND SERVICE

I. Perfection of Christian Service

IS this ever reached in the present life? And if it is, by what act or process is so great a blessing attainable? These are not idle questions; for there are many Christians who think they can or do render such service, some indeed who profess to have passed a decade of years without sinning against God or man.

In seeking to answer these questions it is necessary to bear in mind two things:

1. That perfect service presupposes a perfect heart back of it; for "out of the heart are the issues of life." The rightness or wrongness of human conduct is determined by the ultimate end or aim of the soul. If perfect love is wanting, perfect service is impossible.

2. That if perfect service is rendered by any human being, except Jesus Christ, in this life, we must learn the fact from the Bible rather than from our own experience. For in order to infer from our own experience that our inward life is perfect, we must compare it with some standard, say the inward life of Christ, and must also know that our moral discernment is perfect. One of the most difficult things in the world is to know ourselves, to judge ourselves impartially.

But what do the Scriptures teach?

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us the sins, and cleanse

us from every unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us": 1 John 1:8-10; cf. James 3:2; Rom. 8:10-13; Gal. 5:17; Phil. 3:12; Matt. 6:12; Mark 10:18; see also 1 Kings 8:46; Prov. 20:9; Eccl. 7:20. It is to be observed that, in the eighth verse, John puts himself in the same class with his Christian readers, and that he employs a verb in the present tense, thus referring to the present state of believers; also, that, in the ninth verse, he associates himself with those who should seek forgiveness; and that, in the tenth verse, he uses the perfect tense to describe that which has come over from the past into the present.[1]

3. Yet it has been thought by some to be irreconcilable with other statements of the same epistle; for example, 3:9; 5:18: "Every one who has been begotten from God doeth not sin, because his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he has been begotten from God." "We know that every one who has been begotten from God sinneth not; but he that was begotten from God keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not."

This language is, no doubt, remarkable; but, if it proves that any Christian lives without committing sin, it proves that every Christian does the same. And, if it affirms that all Christians live without sinning, it contradicts the testimony of John himself, as well as the whole tenor of Scripture. See, for example, 1 John 2:1; 5:16; and Gal. 2:11. This, therefore, cannot be its true meaning, however difficult it may be to ascertain that meaning.

4. But it has been supposed to signify one of three things, namely,

(1) That, in so far as the new principle of life is

[1] This view of his language agrees with that of Calvin, Turretin, Lücke, De Wette, and Neander.

concerned, the regenerate man does not commit sin. In this case, that which is highest and best in the believer is spoken of as the person himself, even as Paul in the seventh of Romans says, "But if what I desire not, that I do, it is no more I that perform it, but the sin that dwelleth in me." Thus "the new man" and "the old man" both exist in the Christian: Rom. 6:6; Eph. 4:22, 24; Col. 3:9 sq.

(2) That one who has been begotten of God cannot sin deliberately, habitually, or persistently, since, by the grace of God, the new disposition is stronger than the old.

(3) That one who has been made a child of God will not be suffered to apostatize and perish.

The first of these interpretations is preferable to the second, and the second to the third; though the third may express a truth which is elsewhere taught.

It does not appear, therefore, that John has written anything in this epistle inconsistent with the interpretation given to his language in the first chapter.

5. It may also be remarked, in this connection, that there seems to be no sufficient evidence of the existence of two, and only two, great classes of Christians, namely, a small one, embracing persons who exercise sanctifying faith and enjoy what has been called "the higher Christian life"; and a large one, embracing persons who have justifying faith, but know not the blessedness of perfect trust. It seems more in harmony with the representations of Christian life in the Bible, and with the experience of believers in every age, to say that the varieties of true life and progress are manifold, no two disciples standing on exactly the same plane.

But are Christians set free from the power of sin at death? Or do they enter the other world with the viper still in their bosom? Is the period between death and resurrection a kind of purgatory to many of the

saints? Or is paradise the home and rest of all who have trusted in Christ? The Bible knows nothing of a purgatory for the saints after death. It teaches, rather, that the state of both the righteous and the wicked will be fixed from the hour when they leave this world: Luke 16:22 sq.; 23:43; Phil. 1:23; 2 Cor. 5:8.[1]

Sanctification will therefore be completed at death, but not before. The conflict with sin will be more or less arduous till the call to pass beyond the river comes.

"The way is long, my child! But it shall be
Not one step longer than is best for thee;
And thou shalt know, at last, when thou shalt stand
Safe at the goal, how I did take thy hand,
And quick and straight
Lead to heaven's gate
My child!"

II. Abandonment of Christian Life and Service

Is this in any case absolute and final, so that Christ in turn wholly abandons a regenerate soul? Or, is it probable that persons who have been truly regenerated by the Holy Spirit will be preserved and carried forward in the new life unto the end? That they will be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation?

That some, at least, will "fall from grace" is confidently asserted by a large class of devout Christians; and the arguments which they bring forward in support of their belief are worthy of careful examination. The most important are these: —

1. That analogy favors their doctrine; for not only Adam and Eve, but also holy angels, fell from a state

[1] *Hovey* (A.), "The Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared with the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures"; *Owen* (J.), "On the Remainder of Indwelling Sin," and "On the Mortification of Sin in Believers."

of moral purity. By parity of reason, it may be presumed that men imperfectly sanctified will also, in some instances, fall.

In reply to this argument, it may be said, that the relation of Christians to the Saviour is peculiar. In all probability, the grace of God is given to them in larger measure, and on a different principle, than it was given to our first parents, or to angels in heaven. It is not therefore legitimate to infer the lapse of believers in Christ from that of beings superior to them in goodness, but standing in other relations to divine grace.

2. That Christians are exhorted to persevere; and exhortation to perseverance implies a danger of the opposite. See Rev. 2: 10, 25, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life"; "That which ye have, hold fast until I come"; "Let us fear therefore lest . . . any one of you should seem to have come short of it"; "Let us therefore earnestly endeavor to enter into that rest"; Heb. 4: 1-3, 11.

But, in answer to this, it may be affirmed that exhortations to perseverance hardly prove that those exhorted will *not* persevere. At most, they imply that *without* the exhortations, they might not persevere. Moral means must be used in accomplishing moral ends.

3. That Christians are warned against apostatizing, and must therefore be in danger of this sin: Heb. 6: 4-6, "For it is impossible that they, who have been once enlightened . . . and have fallen away, should again be renewed to repentance" f.; 10: 26-32; 2 Peter 2: 20-22; 3: 7.

The same reply may be made to this argument as to the preceding. Warnings against apostasy do not prove that any of those addressed *will* apostatize; they only prove that the use of means is necessary to *prevent* them from committing so dreadful a sin. The principle involved is aptly illustrated by the narrative of Luke in

Acts (cf. 27:22-25 with verse 31). Contingency and certainty are compatible in the government of God.

4. That cases of apostasy are introduced hypothetically by the sacred writers; and from these the same inference may be drawn, as from exhortations and warnings: Rom. 14:15, "Do not by thy food destroy him for whom Christ died"; (cf. 1 Cor. 8:11; John 15:1-6; Matt. 25:1-13; Luke 8:11 sq.).

In this case, also, the same answer may be made as in the two preceding cases. The passages appealed to are virtually warnings against apostasy or leading others to apostatize. They recognize the moral freedom of Christians, and the natural possibility of their turning utterly away from Christ; but they are written to prevent such a fall; and none of them show that any who are truly united to Christ will finally be lost.

5. That instances of final apostasy are related in the Bible, — as those of Saul, Judas, Hymenæus, Alexander, and others.

In studying the history of Saul, we find no sure evidence that he was ever a child of God. See 1 Sam. 10:9-13; 13:13, 14; 15:10 sq.; 16:13, 14. The gift of the Spirit which he had for a time was apparently official, but he seems never to have possessed a docile and obedient heart.

Still less do we discover any evidence of true piety in the life of Judas, or in the language which either Christ or the evangelists use respecting him. See John 6:64, 70; 12:6; 13:18, 19; 17:12; 18:9. It is not, indeed, easy to account for his being one of the twelve by the free choice of Christ, if he was evil from the first; but this hypothesis agrees better than any other with the narrative of John.

Nor is there any decisive proof that Hymenæus and Alexander were, on the one hand, ever true Christians; or, on the other, finally lost. Both of them were

delivered to Satan in order that they might be taught, by chastisement, not to blaspheme: 1 Tim 1:20. This language suggests Paul's hope of their recovery. Whether the Alexander mentioned in 2 Tim. 4:14, was the same as the one named in 1 Tim. 1:20, is quite uncertain, since the name was a common one among the Greeks; and, if not the same person, there is no evidence of his being a Christian, even by profession.

But the weight of scriptural evidence for the preservation and sanctification of all true believers depends very much upon the view which is taken of God's relation to the work. If it be true that some are chosen to eternal life, and that they are the same as those who are regenerated by the Spirit of God, it follows that they will be guarded by the power of God, through faith unto salvation: 1 Pet. 1:5; but the clause, "through faith," should never be overlooked. The Scriptures furnish no evidence for the opinion that men will be either sanctified or saved, without faith in Christ. If they are kept, they are kept by keeping alive their faith.

It is doubtless conceivable that God has elected some of our race to a temporary faith, — to a state of grace from which they are to fall away and perish; but the Scriptures do not, on the whole, present this view of election. Thus, in 2 Thess. 2:13, 14, the Apostle writes as follows: "But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God from the beginning chose you to salvation, in sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth; whereunto he called you by our gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." And this is not the doctrine of Paul only; Peter expresses the same belief (1 Pet. 1:3-5), "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy begot us again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; unto an

inheritance imperishable and undefiled and unfading, reserved in heaven for you, who, by the power of God, are guarded through faith, unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.[1]

In both these passages the end is salvation; and the means a vital union with Christ, established and maintained by the purpose and grace of God. In both, it is most natural to suppose that the writers considered all true believers as certain of being led by the grace of God, freely given and heartily received, to persevere unto the end. Says Turretin, "Faith is not true because it perseveres; but it perseveres because it is true." It would be still better to say, that it perseveres because the Saviour, by his Spirit and his truth, keeps it alive in the heart which he has renewed; but there is no salvation for men who do not abide in Christ. The purpose of God comprehends the means as well as the end.

[1] Compare also John 10:28-30; 17:11, 12; Rom. 8:28-30, 35-39; Phil. 1:6; Eph. 1:3-6, 11-14 with Matt. 7:22, 23; 25:41-46; 1 John 2:19.

PART SIXTH

ISSUES HEREAFTER

PART SIXTH

ISSUES HEREAFTER

Every thoughtful man feels at times a deep interest in what takes place at the end of this life, and is likely to ask such questions as these: What is the effect of death upon the soul? Does it bring the soul to naught, as it does the body? If not, in what condition does it leave the soul? Does it reverse the soul's moral condition, or leave it unchanged? Will the soul have any body after death, any physical organ or environment, connecting it with the visible universe? Will it be associated with other personal beings? Will it see God any more clearly than it does in the present world? Will it move onward to revolutionary crises in its character or enjoyment? Or will it find rest in a state achieved, a perfection that merely abides as the ripe fruit of the past? If there be any answer to these questions, it must be found in a study of the life of the Risen Christ, and in the prophetic language of the Scriptures. To this study we now advance.

CHAPTER I

ISSUES FOR BELIEVERS

I. In Death. Relation of Death to Christian Life

1. By the word "death" is now meant physical death, a separation of the body from the soul. That this does not involve a termination of conscious existence, is suggested by the words of the Old Testament Preacher, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it": Eccl. 12:7, and is made certain by the language of Christ to his disciples, "Be not afraid of those who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul": Matt. 10:28, as well as by his promise to the dying robber: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise": Luke 23:43.

2. However strongly the phenomena of death impress one with the thought of sinking into a state of total unconsciousness, and however sure one may be that his consciousness cannot be precisely the same out of the body as in the body, there is no solid ground for the opinion that death puts an end to thought and feeling. No person can safely believe that this was true of Jesus Christ, when he died on the cross, saying, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit": Luke 23:46, or of Stephen when he called upon Christ, and said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit": Acts 7:59.

3. Figurative references to death in the New Testament show that it was believed to be a dissolution of the body, rather than a termination of conscious exist-

ence. Thus the body is represented as a tent. "The Word became flesh and lived in a tent among us": John 1:14; "As long as I am in this tent," 2 Pet. 1:13; "Knowing that I must soon put off my tent," 2 Pet. 1:14; "If our earthly tent-house were dissolved, or taken to pieces": 2 Cor. 5:1. It is also for obvious reasons, in the case of Christ, spoken of as a temple that can be destroyed and rebuilt, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up": Jo. 2:19. Still further it is represented as a garment, "For in this tent we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation from heaven": 2 Cor. 5:2. Such language assumes that the body is distinguishable from the conscious self which inhabits it, and that its dissolution does not put an end to the animating spirit.

4. The science of physiology is indeed making it very clear that our present consciousness is dependent on the brain for its action, but it has nothing to say about consciousness out of the body. The language of Prof. John Fiske is not extravagant.

"Cerebral physiology says nothing about another life. Indeed, why should it? The last place in the world to which I should go for information about a state of things in which thought and feeling can exist without a cerebrum would be cerebral physiology. The materialistic assumption that there is no such state of things, and the life of the soul accordingly ends with the life of the body, is, perhaps, the most colossal instance of baseless assumption that is known to the history of philosophy. No evidence of it can be alleged beyond the familiar fact that during the present life we know Soul only in its association with Body, and therefore cannot discover disembodied soul without dying ourselves. This fact must always prevent us from obtaining direct evidence for the belief in the soul's survival. But a negative presumption is not created by the absence of proof in cases where, in the nature of things, proof is inaccessible."[1]

[1] "The Destiny of Man," p. 110.

5. But what relation has physical death to the moral condition of the soul? Many deny that it has any effect upon that condition. By a mere change of its relation to the senses and, through them, to the external world, they believe that the soul's growth in grace cannot be hastened or retarded. The soul separated from the body will at first be in a moral respect just what it was before that separation. Doubtless this will be true as to its deepest life, its fundamental choice and purpose, its positive interest in God and love to his character. But will "the old man" be as vigorous as before? Will "the desire of the flesh and the desire of the eye and the vain boasting of life" be the same as before? Will habits of bodily indulgence be as sore a temptation as they were prior to the great change? Are they not weakened by sickness till we scarcely know them at all? And shall we not be rid of them finally when death sunders our connection with the body? For Christian life, therefore, physical death is a blessing. Paul felt that it would be so for him, especially because it would bring him at once into closer relations with Christ: Phil. 1:21-24.

6. "Let the conditions of our moral and spiritual existence be altered in this one important respect; let the attractions which draw us to earth disappear altogether, and those which draw us to God be not only strengthened, but actually replace them, and then our growth in holiness and heavenly-mindedness will be as sudden as if we were transformed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. We need not suppose that, in the intermediate state, we shall climb up the way of holiness step by step, with many a stumble, and many a relapse, as the Christian pilgrim now does. One moment of the presence of Christ will do more to ripen our character than years of self-discipline here on earth."[1]

[1] *Heard,* "Tripartite Nature of Man," pp. 271-2.

TO CHRISTIAN LIFE

II. IN PARADISE. RELATION OF THE MIDDLE STATE

It is sometimes said that "where death leaves us the judgment will find us." But this can be true in a general sense only, *i. e.,* in so far as we are or are not believers in Christ. For, assuming that the judgment referred to will take place at the end of the world, it is very improbable that there will be no spiritual progress on the part of God's children between death and the final judgment. Notice the following allusions to the state of Christians after death: —

1. *They will be with the Lord.* Of this Paul was so confident that he preferred, looking at himself only, "to be absent from the body and to be at home with the Lord": 2 Cor. 5:8; or, in other words, "to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better": Phil. 1:21-24. This, too, was the best feature of the prediction of Jesus concerning the robber by his side, "To-day thou shalt be *with me* in Paradise": Luke 23:43.

2. *They will be with Abraham,* the father of the faithful, *and with all the ancient worthies,* sharing the blessings which they enjoy; Luke 16:23 f. (and cf. Matt. 8:11). This will be the *ne plus ultra* of human fellowship. Better society than this no Jew could imagine. Such society would be more favorable to growth in all things good and true than any other. It seems to be composed, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, of "the spirits of righteous men made perfect": Heb. 12:23, and, if there be any encouragement or incentive to high attainment in the companionship of holy beings, the souls of believers after death will feel the power of it, and never cease to grow in grace.

3. *They will be in paradise or heaven.* A comparison of Matt. 8:11 with Luke 16:23 f. and 23:43 leads to

the conclusion that Abraham was in paradise while he was in the kingdom of heaven. The word "paradise" may be regarded as bringing to mind the delightfulness of the Christian's state after death, and the expression, "kingdom of heaven," as revealing his moral and religious condition, his fellowship with the holy in serving God and enjoying him forever.

But the teaching of Scripture as to the life of Christians between death and resurrection is naturally meagre, and, for the most part, expressed in figurative speech. It fails, therefore, to answer many of the questions which curiosity asks, *e. g.*, What knowledge have they of the earthly scenes and friends which they have left? Are these as invisible to them as they themselves are to us? What relations do they bear to material objects, to space, to spiritual beings? Are family affections cultivated and old friendships renewed? Do they render service to one another, — the older to the younger, the mature to children? Are they interested in all the works of God, and eager to drink at all the fountains of knowledge? Or is the field of their investigation limited to moral and religious life? to the character and conduct of their associates in paradise?

(1) Not many of these questions can be answered from the Word of God. It may, however, be inferred from the reply of Jesus to the Sadducees, about the woman who had been married to seven brothers in succession, that those who have passed through the gates of death neither marry nor are given in marriage, but in that respect are like the angels. Perhaps the conjugal, parental, and filial affections will cease to play an important part in spiritual life, love and companionship being determined more and more by character and service, by religious sympathies and needs. Yet it can hardly be questioned that if two souls have grown into spiritual harmony here, they will be likely to find each other there.

(2) Moreover, it would not be surprising if objects of sense should lose for the time their powerful hold on disembodied spirits, while the varied and wonderful capabilities and activities of souls should be of absorbing interest. The spiritual treasuries of the universe are far more precious and inexhaustible than all its mines of gold and precious stones. To watch and study the unfolding of a living person in the most favorable circumstances must be a matter of unspeakable wonder and admiration to a soul in paradise.

(3) We can form no positive idea of the relation of finite spirits to space. Negatively, they are not omnipresent. They can act somewhere and with a limited number of minds at the same instant, but only the Infinite Mind can act everywhere and with all other minds continually. Beyond this, it seems impossible to go in representing to ourselves the relations of pure intelligence to space.

(4) The Bible offers no hint of sin on the part of Christians after death. All accounts of the judgment assert or imply that it will be based on deeds done here in the body. To that extent they seem to imply that probation, in the ordinary sense of the word, is not extended beyond the present life. But this question will call for consideration in speaking of those who die in unbelief.

III. In the Resurrection. Relation of the Resurrection to Christian Life[1]

Man was created an organic being, with body and soul in vital union and interaction. And it is safe to assume that his nature at the beginning was a forecast and type

[1] *West* (G.), "Observations on the History and Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ"; *Macpherson* (R.), "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ"; *Milligan* (W.), "The Resurrection of our Lord"; *Morrison* (C. R.), "The Proofs of Christ's Res-

of what it will be at the end; the germinal humanity was indicative of what humanity would become when its ideal was reached. This promise wrought, as it were, into his nature at the first, was repeated with emphasis by the resurrection of Jesus Christ and his ascension into heaven. For he was raised and exalted as the God-man. This, beyond any reasonable doubt, is the teaching of the New Testament and was the belief of all the Apostles. The corner-stone of their faith in the resurrection of the dead was their knowledge of Christ's resurrection. To this they bore unwavering testimony, though death stared them in the face. It will therefore be proper for us to examine their testimony to intercourse with the risen Christ, and afterwards their predictions of the resurrection of all the pious dead.

1. *They testify that Jesus foretold his own resurrection.* The Apostle John says that he referred enigmatically to this event in his early ministry, "Destroy this temple," meaning the temple of his body, — "and in three days I will raise it up": John 2:18-21. But his more explicit statements were made during the last few months of his ministry: Matt. 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22; Matt. 17:23; Mark 9:31; Matt. 20:19; Mark 10:34; Luke 18:33; cf. John 10:14, 17, 18; 12:24, 32. According to these records Jesus foretold his death and resurrection on the third day, on at least three occasions. The language used is perfectly clear, though it must have been taken to be highly figurative when it was heard by the disciples. Without doubt their belief in Christ, as appointed by God to be a great earthly King, led them to think his words figurative and above

urrection from a Lawyer's Standpoint"; *Steinmeyer* (F. L.), "The History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord, considered in the light of Modern Criticism"; *Stapfer* (E.), "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ"; *Hovey* (A.), "The Miracles of Christ," p. 271 ff.; "Biblical Eschatology," ch. ii.

their comprehension; but they afterwards recalled them as clear prognostications of what had been fulfilled almost before their eyes.

2. *They testify that he appeared to them many times after his resurrection.* Perhaps the earliest written testimony that has come down to us is that of Paul: 1 Thess. 4:14; 5:10; 1 Cor. 15:3-8; Rom. 1:4; 4:25; 5:10, and often. In the remarkable statement of 1 Cor. 15:3-8, this Apostle affirms that Jesus appeared, after his three days in the tomb, to Peter, to the twelve, to above five hundred at once, to James, again to all the Apostles, and at last to Paul himself. This is for the most part testimony at second hand. But it is the testimony of a keen-sighted and absolutely honest man, a man who had been convinced against his will of the supreme fact which he proclaimed, a man who had seen the Lord and heard his voice in circumstances which left no doubt in his mind of its being Jesus who appeared to him: 1 Cor. 9:1; Acts 22:14, 15. Many years had passed since he became an Apostle of Christ, and during those years he had met some if not all of the earlier Apostles, and must have heard from them an account of the various manifestations which the Lord had made of himself to them during the Forty Days.

He does not indeed mention all the instances which are spoken of by the Evangelists, for example, his appearance to Mary Magdalene, to the women, to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, or to the seven by the sea of Galilee, but neither does any one of the evangelists record them all. In such a case a part is better than the whole; for each of the narratives is manifestly no servile copy of another but the testimony of an independent writer. If the later Gospels had repeated the precise testimony of the earlier, adding to it, but omitting nothing, there would be far less value in their testimony than there is with all their diversities.

The testimony of Peter as recorded by Luke in the Acts is likewise positive. In his discourse to the mixed multitude on the Day of Pentecost he lays great stress on the resurrection of Jesus Christ: 2:24 f. The same fact is emphasized in his address to the men of Israel who ran together in Solomon's portico, after the lame man had been healed in the name of Jesus: 3:15 f. And when this Apostle, together with John, was afterwards brought before the Sanhedrin, he reiterated the same truth: 4:10. When brought a second time before the same court, Peter and the Apostles said, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree": 5:20, 30. The same fact was announced to Cornelius by the path-breaker in preaching the Word, and the Spirit of God ratified his message: 10:40.

It is not, however, denied by good scholars that the Apostles and many other Christians were honestly convinced that they had seen with their natural eyes the risen Jesus. But may they not have been mistaken in respect to the objective reality of what they seemed to see? Was it not an illusion, wholly mental, the product of overwrought imagination?

In order to believe this we must reject the distinct record of Christ's predictions concerning his resurrection on the third day, the unqualified assertion of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, that those predictions were fulfilled, the public assertion of the same fact by Peter in Jerusalem, the deliberate affirmation of Paul to the same effect, with his powerful array of witnesses, and the confidence with which he himself and the other Apostles rested the truth of their entire message on the fact of Christ's resurrection. That so many persons should have been deceived by waking visions, a dozen or even five hundred at a time, is incredible. That men like James and Thomas should have been made to believe that they saw the Lord when they did not is incredible.

That the writers of the New Testament should have proclaimed with one voice the miracles of Christ and his resurrection from the dead, while both were imaginary, and should, nevertheless, have depicted in him the ideal man, "holy, harmless, undefiled," is altogether incredible.

3. *They predict the resurrection of all believers in Christ.* The writers of the New Testament do this: —

(1) By recording the words of Christ to this effect: Luke 14: 14, "For thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just"; 20: 34 f.; John 6: 54; 11: 24 f. (cf. John 5: 28, 29). Such language is above criticism. Jesus Christ refers to the resurrection of the righteous as an event certain to take place in the future.

(2) By testifying their own belief: 1 Cor. 6: 14, "God hath both raised the Lord, and will raise up us through his power"; 15: 3-58; 2 Cor. 4: 14; Phil. 3: 11; 1 Thess. 4: 14, 15; (cf. Acts 24: 15). Here again the language employed is extremely direct and unqualified. The belief of the Apostles in the resurrection of the dead is not subject to doubt. They may have been in error holding such a belief, but we cannot err in thinking they held it.

4. *They predict a resurrection of men with real, not ethereal, bodies*: 1 Cor. 15: 35, 36, 38, "With what kind of body do they come"? ff. The difficulty of believing in the resurrection appears to have centred, at that time, in the nature of the human body, perhaps in the assumption that the body, laid in the grave and mingling with its kindred dust, could not be re-united with the soul, or, if it could, would be unworthy of perpetuation in another life. "If Christians are to be raised up to a new life, they must have bodily organs as well as souls; will you tell us with what sort of bodies they will come?"

5. *They represent the bodies of raised saints as certain to be very different from those which they have in*

their earthly life: 1 Cor. 15:42-54; Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor. 6:13. Their present bodies are earthy, corruptible, weak; their resurrection bodies will be celestial, incorruptible, glorious. The difference between them cannot easily be overstated, unless it be by denying that spiritual bodies are really bodies at all.

6. *They teach that the raised bodies of believers in Christ will be adapted to spirit life, as their present bodies are adapted to animal life:* 1 Cor. 15:44, "It is sown a natural (psychical) body, it is raised a spiritual (pneumatical) body." A natural or psychical body is an organ for the *psyche* (ψυχή) or animal life; a spiritual or pneumatic body is an organ for the rational spirit or *pneuma* (πνεῦμα). This appears to be the distinction laid down by the Apostle; and it is the most important one named by him. Indeed, it includes all the rest, and deserves the closest study. This view is stated by Augustine in his treatise, *"De Civitate Dei,"* XIII. 20, 22: "For as spirit that serves the flesh is called carnal, so flesh that serves the spirit is called spiritual; not because it is converted into spirit, but because it is subject to spirit with a supreme and marvellous facility of obeying, having no sense of weariness, no liability to decay, and no tardiness of motion."

7. *They declare that the raised bodies of saints will be in some respects similar to their present bodies,* being probably material in substance, human in form, and individual in features and expression. Whether they will be connected with their predecessors by means of the identity of any of the particles of matter composing them, is uncertain and of no consequence. But if Jesus Christ had his resurrection body during the Forty Days, it is probably true that the selfsame atoms of matter which were in his crucified body were in his risen body, yet so changed in their relations to the whole organism and to the ruling spirit within as to be a spiritual body.

(1) Three suppositions have been made as to the change by which Christ's natural body became "the body of his glory": Phil. 3:21, *first,* that it took place before he left the tomb, so that he lived forty days in his heavenly body before he was taken up; *second,* that it took place gradually, during the forty days, beginning when he left the tomb and being complete when he disappeared in the clouds; and *third,* that it took place at the ascension, his body, during the forty days being the same, and in the same condition, as before the crucifixion.

(2) We do not find anything in the Gospel narratives favorable to the second hypothesis, any indications that the disciples perceived that a change was going on in the body of their loved and risen Lord. Between the first and the third it is somewhat difficult to decide. In favor of the third is the circumstance that on one occasion he partook of food, — evidently to convince his disciples of the reality of his bodily presence. His body was therefore capable of receiving and assimilating food. But, on the other hand, there is no hint of his suffering hunger, as he did during the forty days after his baptism, no hint of his living as of old with his disciples, but rather intimations of his appearing to them unexpectedly, as if his home were no longer with them. His partaking of food may have been a condescension to their weakness rather than a revelation of his own. His whole bearing was that of one who belongs to a higher sphere of life.

(3) We therefore incline to the first view, and believe with some degree of confidence that his disciples were furnished by his manifestations of himself to them with evidence of his resurrection to eternal life with a body adapted to that life, and not with evidence of the reanimation of his corruptible body. Paul appears to have thought of it in this way, when he puts the appearance

of Christ to himself on a line with his appearances to the older Apostles. And believing, as we do, that the Scriptures mean by a spiritual body a real body, material and tangible, yet perfectly adapted to the spirit, we do not see that the evidence of Christ's bodily resurrection is weakened at all by this hypothesis.

(4) Of course, the resurrection will put Christians again into sensible relations with the material universe. They will be denizens of two worlds, and better able than now to perceive the subtle relations which bind them together, and the marvellous wisdom revealed in them both. The life of man will thus be perfected according to the divine ideal, and started on its endless career of progress in knowledge, in goodness, and in joy.

But a question of less intrinsic importance, yet of great human interest, is still unanswered, viz., *When are believers in Christ to be raised from the dead?* We can expect an answer to this question from no other oracle than the Word of God, and as the answer must be predictive, the interpreter of it will have to encounter all the obscurities of predictive language.

8. *Believers in Christ will be raised from the dead at the last day, or the end of the present age.*

It is proper to exhibit with some care other current interpretations of Scripture on this point, as well as the one which seems to us correct. The most important of the other interpretations are two: (1) that the resurrection of believers in Christ is coetaneous with their death, and (2), that their resurrection will immediately precede the millennium foretold by John in the book of Revelation.

a. *The resurrection of believers takes place at the time of their death.* In putting off the natural body they put on the spiritual body. They are never, therefore, for a moment bodiless, spiritual beings. In support of this opinion reference is made to several parts of the New

Testament: Luke 20:34-38; John 11:25, 26; 1 Cor. 15:36-38, 42-44. These, with certain other less decisive passages, are supposed to establish the opinion, especially as it obviates the difficulty of an abnormal and inconceivable life of disembodied souls, and has in its favor certain phenomena in the life of animals, for example, that of the butterfly and that of the frog.

(a) In regard to the first passage (Luke 20:34-38), as a proof of the concomitance of death and resurrection, it may be remarked, that the matter in debate was not the *time* but the *actuality* of a resurrection of the dead, and further, that the use of the present tense in the clause, "but that the dead are raised," is accounted for by supposing it to express a general fact, without regard to time.[1]

The argument of Jesus is complete, if we assume that to him and to the Sadducees the reality of life after death is in itself a prophecy and pledge of resurrection to the righteous.

(b) In regard to the second passage (John 11:25, 26), it may be remarked, that Martha confesses her belief in the resurrection of her brother at the last day, and that Jesus, to prepare her mind for the miracle which he was ready to perform, tells her that he himself is the principle and source of the resurrection at the last day, or, if he should please in the case of Lazarus, at the present time. There is no reason to suppose that he intended to suggest to Martha a doubt as to resurrection "at the last day," as she understood the expression, and a belief that he himself was now raising the dead, in the sense of giving them their spiritual bodies. Nor is there any ground for the opinion that Lazarus was raised to a life like that of angels, no longer subject to death.

(c) In regard to the third passage, 1 Cor. 15:36-38, 42-44, it may be said, in the *first* place, that the point

[1] See *Hadley*, 697; *Goodwin*, 205, 1; *Burton*, p. 8, 12.

which Paul wished to illustrate was not the *time* of the resurrection, but the *possibility* or the *probability* of it. Therefore he says, "The kernel of seed does not wholly die, but the life of it reappears in a new plant. Indeed, it cannot thus reappear with a new and larger integument unless the old one be cast off in death." And, then, in the *second* place, to meet the skeptical question, "With what kind of body do they come?" he calls attention to the great variety of bodies in the natural world, and affirms that, when one sows, he does not sow the body that shall be, but bare grain, and God gives it a body not identical with that which was sown, but adapted to its nature.

Then, to show the vast improvement in the qualities of the resurrection body as compared with the present body, he retains his figure of sowing as analogous to death, and says, having specially in mind the body, "The sowing is in corruption, the raising in incorruption; the sowing is in dishonor, the raising in glory; the sowing is in weakness, the raising in power; the sowing is of a natural body, the raising of a spiritual body." So different will the resurrection body be from that which is laid in the grave! In all this there is no reference to the time of the resurrection, and it is obviously unsafe to apply an illustration beyond the limits of its application by the writer.

There is a modification of this view which deserves notice. Dr. Israel P. Warren, in a work on "The Parousia" of Christ, holds that the abode of ante-Christian saints after death was in Hades, until the coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem; then they were transferred to heaven, and this transference to heaven he supposes to be called a resurrection: 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 51, 52. Since that time, all believers in Christ not only receive at death their spiritual bodies, but pass at once into the heavenly state. This seems to

be playing fast and loose with the meaning of resurrection in order to save a theory, — a theory, too, which, in so far as it concerns the resurrection of the dead, rests on insecure biblical foundations.[1]

The positive biblical grounds for rejecting the opinion that natural death and spiritual resurrection are simultaneous, will be stated in supporting our proposition, that believers in Christ will be raised from the dead at the end of the present age.

b. *The resurrection of believers in Christ will take place just before the millennium foretold in the book of Revelation.* The adherents of this view are numerous and active. Many of them are accomplished scholars; many of them are earnest evangelists; and it cannot be denied that they have been gaining influence for a long time.

As interpreters, they are distinguished for their insistence on the literal meaning of the Scriptures, and for their belief in the possibility of understanding the details of prophecy. Yet their interest in the time of the resurrection of believers depends on the supposed connection of that event with the return of Christ to reign visibly in Jerusalem. As evangelists they appeal to the nearness of that return as a motive to fidelity in preaching the gospel to all the nations, expecting the return of Christ when that is done. Their views deserve the most respectful consideration, but are not to be accepted as correct unless justified by the fairest principles of interpretation.

(a) The cardinal passage is Rev. 20:4-6.[2] On this passage we remark, that the book of Revelation is a series of visions, the imagery of which is symbolical and

[1] *Bush* (G.), "Anastasis; or, the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body"; "The Parousia"; *Thomas* (R.), "Through Death to Life"; *Warren* (I. P.), "The Parousia; Critical Study of Scripture Doctrine of Christ's Second Coming."

[2] Cf. "Biblical Eschatology," p. 66 ff.

rarely explained in literal terms. The twentieth chapter is no exception to the general character of the book. The verses preceding, 4-6, are symbolical, and so perhaps are the following. Hence the paragraph in question may simply characterize in figurative language a long period in which faithful men will abound and have a controlling influence. Through them Christ will reign. Those who honor him will guide the forces of society. Persecution will cease. The appearance of these hosts of faithful men will seem like the reappearance of the holy martyrs and steadfast confessors of past ages, like the coming again of Elijah in the person of John the Baptist. And so this is called a resurrection; and indeed the "first resurrection" in contrast with the reappearance of all the fierce persecutors of the past in the gathering hosts of Gog and Magog, which are silently assumed to be the second resurrection of the prophetic tableau. This seems to be a possible interpretation of an obscure passage in a book containing many sayings hard to be understood. We prefer it to the premillennial exposition; especially because we shrink from resting an important doctrine on a single passage.

(b) Other passages are, however, said to speak of the resurrection of believers as antedating that of unbelievers. Of these the most important are 1 Cor. 15:23, 24, and Phil. 3:11. But the confirmation afforded by these verses is very doubtful, for it is unnecessary to suppose that a resurrection *from* the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν) means anything more than a resurrection by which those who share in it are forever separated from those who remain in the power of death eternal, while the resurrection *of* the dead (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν) embraces all the dead, including those who are subject to the second death. This explanation accounts for Paul's language in Phil. 3:11, while in 1 Cor. 15:23, 24, and in 1 Thess. 4:13-17, only believers are spoken of. John 5:29; Acts 24:15, and

Rev. 20: 13, agree with the doctrine that all the dead will be raised in the same period of time.

(c) Still other representations are believed to confirm the *prima facie* meaning of Rev. 20: 4-6, viz., those which seem to say that Christ will return visibly to the earth, and reign as king in Jerusalem, with the children of Israel as his most honored ministers. In favor of this are alleged the words of Jesus in Matt. 19: 28: "Verily I say to you, that ye who followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." But this language, plainly figurative, probably refers to the last judgment. Compare Rev. 4: 4, where it is written that "round about the throne were four and twenty thrones," and 1 Cor. 6: 2, where the Apostle teaches that "the saints shall judge the world." That Jesus had in mind the administration of affairs in his Messianic kingdom on earth is by no means evident.

More natural is the supposition that he thought of such administration in the words reported by Luke 19: 12 f.: "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return," etc. But even here it is needless to assume that Jesus meant to predict his return from heaven to reign as a visible king on earth, and to reward his faithful servants with authority over many or few cities, according to what they had done.

"To receive a kingdom," says Dr. Bliss, "signifies the sending of the Son of man forth again in the glory of his Father and of the holy angels, when every knee shall bow before him, and every tongue shall confess that he is Lord."

Note also the comment of Plumptre:

"'Authority over ten cities' must have something corresponding to it, some energy and work of guidance, in the realities of the unseen world, and cannot simply be understood as fulfilled in the beatific vision or the life of ceaseless praise and adoration."

(d) Many other passages are interpreted as proofs of the resurrection of believers and the return of Christ to reign in visible glory during the thousand years, but none of them are conclusive. There does not seem to be a single unequivocal declaration that saints after the resurrection will dwell on earth in their glorified bodies and take part in giving the gospel to mankind. An unbiased study of the New Testament will lead to the conclusion that their work here, as servants of Christ, is to be done by faith and not by sight.

a. Jesus himself told his disciples that it would be better for them if he should go away, and another Advocate, the Holy Spirit, take his place. He said also to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed. Happy they who have not seen, and have believed!" John 16:7 f.; 20:29. When we think of the Pentecost and of the work of the Spirit in human hearts from that day to this, the wisdom of God in Christ's withdrawal is plainly seen. The omnipresent Spirit can do more for the souls of men than the visible and localized Jesus. But if Jesus were visibly present on earth there is reason to suppose that even Christians would gather in throngs about him and be comparatively indifferent to the unseen Spirit. Their cry would be, "Lo here!" and "Lo there!" while their great need would be faith in the Unseen and the Eternal.

b. This seems to have been the conviction of Peter also, if we may rely upon the second epistle ascribed to him, for in that epistle he writes these significant words: "Beloved, let not this one thing escape you, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not tardy in respect to the promise, as some account tardiness; but is long-suffering toward you, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance": 2 Peter 3:8, 9.

c. Returning to our proposition, "Believers in Christ

will be raised from the dead at the last day," we call attention to the teaching of Paul in 1 Thess. 4: 13 f.: "For this we say to you, in the word of the Lord, that we the living, who remain to the coming of the Lord, shall by no means precede those who are fallen asleep. Because the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a shout . . . and the dead in Christ will first rise. Then we, the living, who remain, will be caught up together with them in clouds into the air to meet the Lord; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Notice that the raised saints and those who are still alive are to be caught up together into the air to meet the Lord, and so, — probably, so caught up as to be in the air, — we shall be ever with the Lord. There is, at all events, no mention of a return to the earth to be with the Lord here.

Again, in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians he appears to speak of the same event with reference to the bad as well as the good, 1: 6-10: "Since it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to those who afflict you; and to you who are afflicted, rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and on those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus . . . when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all who believed . . . in that day." If these two passages do not refer to the same time, and that "the last day," it is not easy to see how that day could be referred to.

Yet nothing is said of any change in the bodies of those who are at that time living on earth. They are to be caught up into the air to meet the Lord and to be with him, but whether in the body or out of the body Paul does not say. Yet he supplies this lack in a later epistle written to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 15: 51, 52: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed [if we do not sleep] in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last

trump: for the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."

d. With these statements of Paul may be associated many others found in the New Testament: Matt. 13: 39-43, 49, 50; 25: 14-30, 31-46; John 5:29; 6: 40, 44, 54; Acts 17: 31; 1 Cor. 3: 13; 4: 5; 2 Cor. 5: 10; Rom. 2: 12-16; Rev. 20: 11-15, from which it appears that the resurrection is the immediate antecedent of the last judgment, not of a thousand years of earthly ministry, followed by a short period of terror and conflict.

e. We have already stated the reason why the resurrection has so important an influence on the progress of Christian life.

"If modern materialism has done no other service to truth, we may at least credit it with this: it has revived our reverence for the human body, has shown how cunning is its workmanship, has pointed out how great a help it is to the highest delights and activities of the soul."[1]

Perhaps the advancement of science may justify the conclusion which some have reached, that the soul is an organific power, making for itself unconsciously a body adapted to its condition and environment, a power not dependent upon a material organ for existence, but incapable of its highest excellence without such an organism. If this be the case, resurrection would be none the less a work of God, though effected by mysterious energies inherent in the soul from creation. Physiology may yet render service to theology at this point.

To this suggestion of zoölogy two objections may perhaps be made from a biblical point of view, *first,* that souls remain so long disembodied, and *second,* that the change from a natural to a spiritual body is described by the Apostle as instantaneous.

(*a*) In reply to the first objection it may be said that souls cannot make for themselves a suitable organism

[1] *A. H. Strong.*

unless the proper materials are provided by their environment. And God works by slow processes. A thousand years are with him a single day. But when the train is laid, when everything has been slowly prepared, momentous changes are effected swiftly, one day is equal to a thousand years.

(*b*) In reply to the second objection something similar may be said. The coming of Christ may be timed in view of many conditions. And possibly it would not be too bold for one to assume that God may provide natural means for effecting in a surprisingly brief period a change as wonderful as that of turning water into wine. What is suggested by the expulsion of our first parents from the Garden of Eden, lest they should "take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever"? The methods of God's working are but imperfectly known, and it was no part of the Spirit's office to reveal them by inspiration to the prophets or Apostles.

IV. In the Last Day. Relation of the Last Day to Christian Life

There can be no reasonable doubt of the application of Paul's great sentence, that "all things work together for good to them that love God," to the manifestation of the righteous judgment of God at the last day. So august a tribunal and so wonderful a review of the past, dark with human sin and radiant with divine love, must stir the spiritual nature of believers to its depths, and furnish the highest possible motives to gratitude and devotion. Says Professor Phelps:

> "To me the day of judgment seems more valuable for its righting the self-accusations of good people, than for its condemnation of the wicked. These awful tribunals of conscience need an illuminating from infinite love, and they are sure to get it."

The Scriptures clearly predict: —

1. *A last judgment or a judgment at the last day:* Matt. 25: 31-46; John 5: 22, 27, 29; Acts 17: 31, "He has fixed a day, in which he is going to judge the world in righteousness, by a man whom he has appointed, having given assurance to all by raising him from the dead"; Rom. 14: 9, 10; Rev. 20: 11-15. No comment would add anything to the distinctness, simplicity, or impressiveness of these representations.

2. *It will be a general judgment.* All men of all ages of the world will give account of themselves to God: Matt. 12: 36, 37; 25: 32, "Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them one from another," etc.; Acts 17: 31; Rom. 14: 10; 2 Cor. 5: 10; 2 Thess. 1: 6-10; Rev. 20: 11-15; Eccl. 12: 14. Taken together, these representations remove all ground for doubt as to the universality of the judgment. All men capable of moral action in this life will be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ. Some theologians teach that believers in Christ will not be brought before the bar of God. Their sins have been forgiven; they are not under law, but under grace; any review of their lives must, therefore, be worse than useless. Dr. Phelps did not think so; Paul did not think so; Christ did not think so: Luke 19: 16 f.

Others with more reason have thought that Christians will be first judged, and then take part with Christ in judging the wicked: Matt. 19: 28; Luke 22: 30; 1 Cor. 6: 2 c.f.; also Matt. 25: 21, 23; Luke 19: 17-19; Rom. 5: 17; Rev. 22: 5. It is not easy to determine the exact meaning of these statements; whether they refer to the judgment itself, or to something which may precede or follow that crisis; or whether some of them refer to one thing, and others to another.

3. *It will be a righteous judgment:* Acts 17: 31, "He is going to judge the world in righteousness, by a man

whom he has appointed"; Rom. 2:6; 2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 6:7-10; Eph. 6:8; Rev. 2:23; 20:12; 22:12 sq. This fact should be frequently and earnestly asserted, when the last judgment is referred to. It should be urged with all possible emphasis, as a first truth of Christianity, that no man will be wronged in the least by the final sentence, — that every one will be sent to his own place. The final day will bring a *revelation* of the *righteous* judgment of God, and will thus render it forever impossible for the good to doubt his righteousness, or be troubled at the dark features of his providence. Such a judgment, vindicating the ways of God to men, and setting plainly before them the wonders of his holiness and grace, can only be effected at the end of the world.

4. *It will be administered by Jesus Christ.* This is perhaps the most interesting fact concerning it. Some passages appear to emphasize his human nature as if it, in some way, made it suitable for him to fill the office of judge: John 5:27. Whether it is because honor should be put on his suffering humanity, or because his human sympathy would make him a merciful judge, is possibly doubtful, though the former reason is naturally suggested by the words in John's Gospel.

V. In the After Life

1. How can one speak of this without belittling its greatness?

"When what at present limits us shall be taken away, will *time* itself also, as the measure of existence, disappear? If we imagine those limitations removed, we find that we still possess a life of imperishable duration in time; a life which

[1] "Biblical Eschatology," pp. 156-60; *Bickersteth* (E. H.), "Hades and Heaven: What does Scripture reveal?"; *Hamilton* (J.), "Beyond the Stars: or, Heaven, its Inhabitants, Occupations, and Life"; *Killen* (J. M.), "Our Friends in Heaven," etc.;

grows not old, but continually abides in unweakened power and never-failing fulness; a consciousness which loses nothing it has once possessed, and which can call up from the mine of memory the most distant past with unfettered freedom. Such an existence, we perceive, must subjectively afford the purest satisfaction, for it is fixed yet variable, simple yet manifold, becoming yet remaining, active yet at rest, susceptible of the highest bliss and of clear reflection of God's image. Time would then have become only the immanent form wherein life was carried on in perfect freedom, but life would still be *life in time*." [1]

2. Less profoundly it may be remarked that, by the acquisition of a body perfectly adapted to his spiritual nature, now in harmony with God, the physical creation will be apprehended as never before. By self-adjusting organs of sight, more delicate and powerful than microscope and telescope combined, worlds adorned with infinite varieties of color, central suns and revolving planets of every hue and glory, may be brought into closest contact with his soul; while, at the opposite extreme, radiant atoms and molecular palaces, modest flowers and glittering dewdrops, luminous clouds and sunset skies, kindle admiration and delight.

3. By organs of hearing perfectly adapted to his soul, now in harmony with God, other no less wonderful qualities of the physical universe may be sensibly perceived and felt. Regions which seem to us silent as night may prove to be full of sweet sounds and chords of heavenly music. All motion may report itself in sound. The circling spheres may be an orchestra, and their discourse rich in thought and melody. Instead of the few octaves which our dull ears can catch from

Harbaugh (H.), "Heaven" — "The Heavenly Home" — "The Heavenly Recognition," 3 vols., separate; *Thompson* (A. C.), "Lyra Cœlestis: Hymns on Heaven"; *Montague* (R.), "Heaven."

[1] Urwick's Translation of *Müller's* "Christian Doctrine of Sin," II., p. 118 f.

the unmeasured diapason of nature, saints in their glorified bodies may be able to hear them all. There will be no notes too high or too low, no harmonies too sweet or too majestic, no scores too intricate or too varied. But of all sounds it may well be that then, as now, those of the human voice will be the dearest, and social intercourse one of the prime delights of heaven itself.

4. But it is unnecessary to speak of all our bodily senses. They will be suited to the activities of the rational spirit in a life of endless progress. And the life of that spirit will not be self-centred. Its activities will not have enjoyment for their end. They will answer to the impulse of love and go out in service to others. As Richard Rothe has said, "The great question in the life to come will not be what we *know,* but what we *are;* and in connection with this, what we can *do.*" And he beautifully adds, "What a comforting thought it is for the man who suits no calling here on earth, that God will *there* have some little post ready, even for him, in which He will have work for him to do." And the writer well remembers a remark of Eustace C. Fitz, that he "could not bear to think of heaven, except as a place where there was enough to do."

CHAPTER II

ISSUES FOR UNBELIEVERS

I. Relation of Death to Unbelievers

1. The Scriptures do not reveal any difference between the death of unbelievers and that of believers, so far as its effect upon conscious existence is concerned. In neither case does it put an end to the life of the soul, though it may, and probably does, make some change in the direction and force of that life. Consciousness out of the body must differ from consciousness in the body, perhaps by being simpler and less distracted, possibly by losing the steadying influence of the slow and uniform processes of nature.

2. As to the feelings with which death is met by unbelievers, in comparison with those of believers, very little is said by the sacred writers, and nothing by Jesus Christ. One of the proverbs reads, "The wicked is thrust down in his evil doing; but the righteous has hope in his death": 14:32; and Paul declares that "the sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law," and then adds, "but thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ": 1 Cor. 15:56, 57. But in a majority of instances the weakening effect of disease prevents serious thought, so that men die without alarm, even when they have no cheering hope of a better life. Of course there are exceptions to this rule. Some are conscience-stricken and meet the end with terror and remorse. Of others, however, it may be said, "There are no bands in their death, but their strength is firm" (Ps. 73:4).

II. Relation of Hades to Unbelievers

From the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke 16:23-26, and from the words of Peter in his epistles: 1 Pet. 3:19; 2 Pet. 2:9, it is necessary to conclude that unbelievers are miserable after death. Their disembodied life is not one of enlargement, but one of restraint, and it is immaterial how that restraint is imposed, whether by the laws of their own moral nature or by the action of external forces, whether their jailer be conscience, or some other minister of God (cf. Rom. 13:4). And the same may be affirmed in respect to their suffering — the loss and pain which are the penal consequences of sin.

But is there no remedial tendency in their suffering? Are they not still "prisoners of hope," and likely, in many cases, if not in all, to repent and to be forgiven? Every lover of God and man would be glad to believe this probable and, indeed, certain. But is there evidence in the Word of God that such restoration will be accomplished? A number of scholars believe that they find it in a few sentences of Holy Scripture, and especially in 1 Pet. 3:19 and 4:6. But there are grave reasons for distrusting their interpretation of these passages.[1]

1. The aim of this entire epistle is to encourage believers in Christ to be steadfast in times of bitter persecution, even though such persecution may issue in death for Christ's sake and the gospel's.

2. The paragraph in which these verses occur seeks to accomplish this purpose with an earnestness and force

[1] *Johnstone* (R.), "The First Epistle of Peter. Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary"; *Leighton* (R.), "A Practical Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter"; *Lillie* (J.), "Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter"; *Farrar* (F. W.), "Wider Hope," etc.; *Plumptre* (E. H.), "The Spirits in Prison," etc.; *Williams* (N. M.), "Commentary on the Epistles of Peter" in "An American Commentary on the New Testament."

of appeal which make it the very heart of the epistle. That Peter should have turned aside to speak of a wholly different and unusual subject in this paragraph, is therefore extremely improbable.

3. Previously, in the same epistle, Peter speaks of the Spirit of Christ which was in the ancient prophets, and which testified beforehand of the sufferings awaiting Christ and the glories that would follow them: 1 Pet. 1:11. And in his second epistle he writes of Noah as a "preacher of righteousness," who was preserved, with seven others, when "the world of ungodly men" was destroyed by the flood: 2 Pet. 2:5.

4. It cannot be esteemed very improbable that Peter should think and speak of the ungodly contemporaries of Noah as "the spirits in prison," *i. e.*, now in prison, or that he should speak of Christians who had suffered martyrdom, as "dead men" to whom the gospel was formerly preached, in order that they might, according to human decisions, be condemned in flesh, but, on the other hand, according to God's decision, live in spirit. In other words, their physical death by the judgment of men was embraced in the high purpose of God who made them partakers of his own life through Christ in their spiritual nature.

For these reasons, we distrust the interpretation which finds in the Apostle's words an assertion that Christ preached the gospel in Hades after his crucifixion, and adopt the interpretation which supposes that Peter refers, in the first verse, to Christ's preaching through the inspired voice and work of Noah, and, in the second, to the preaching of those who had carried the gospel to Asia Minor where some who had received it had already, when this epistle was written, suffered martyrdom for Christ's sake.

5. Others, *e. g.*, Julius Müller, have discovered in what Jesus says concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit

evidence that repentance and forgiveness will have place in the intermediate state. For, according to Matt. 12:32, Jesus said, "Whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him, neither in this age, nor in that which is to come." The last clause, "nor in that which is to come," is thought to be added as a distinct intimation that other sins are forgiven in the age to come, if not in this age, of course upon the universal condition of repentance. We have no confidence in this interpretation. For Jesus may have spoken from the Jewish standpoint, meaning, that neither in the Jewish period, nor in the Messianic period, will defamation of the Holy Spirit be open to forgiveness. Or he may have used the double expression merely for the sake of emphasis: such a sin will *never* be forgiven, never, to all eternity! And it is worthy of consideration that Mark says, "will never have forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin," while Luke says, "but to him who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven."

6. It may, however, be urged that, in the nature of the case, any man who repents and believes in Christ will be forgiven. It matters not how long he has sinned or at what stage of his development as a moral being he may be, repentance will bring him into harmony with God and therefore into favor with God. If the lost son comes to himself and returns to his Father he will meet a father's welcome. This is doubtless true. But the question remains, Will he repent? Is there any reason to believe that one who enters Hades will truly seek the Lord? Or is there, rather, reason to believe that he has gone to "his own place"? That he is morally what and where he wishes to be? In the Scriptures, alas, we find no indications of repentance in the state after death.

7. Nor is it easy to discover in the biblical accounts of souls in Hades any rational ground for hoping that they will accept a religious life there which they refused here. There are many natural ties and sweet associations here, that serve to soften the heart and even the conscience, which can hardly be found there. Evil spirits are presumably worse than evil men. There may be some increase of knowledge there, but not of love or of tenderness. Associates will not be helpful to reverence or conscientiousness or humility. In a word, this life is in every respect more favorable to a radical change of character than we can presume the next stage of human life to be.

III. Relation of the Resurrection to Unbelievers

1. There are but two, possibly three, passages in the Bible which foretell the resurrection of unbelievers. But one of these is so simple and unambiguous as to count for a great deal by way of evidence. It is the language of Jesus preserved by the Apostle John: 5:29, which affirms that "all who are in the tombs will hear his voice, and will come forth; they that did good, to the resurrection of life, and they that practised evil, to the resurrection of judgment," or condemnation.

The second passage is Luke's report of a part of Paul's words to Felix the governor: Acts 24:15, which describe Paul as "having a hope toward God, which these themselves also look for, that there will be a resurrection both of righteous and unrighteous men." Some, indeed, have endeavored to break the force of this language by suggesting that Luke may not have reported Paul's speech accurately; but there is no more reason for this suggestion in the present case than in twenty others.

The third passage is Rev. 20:13, 14, "And the sea gave up the dead who were in it; and death and Hades

gave up the dead who were in them; and they were judged every one according to their works. And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire." The word "resurrection" does not occur in the whole paragraph of which these verses are a part; but no intelligent reader is likely to deny that when the seer "saw the dead, the small and the great, standing before the throne," he saw them as men, not as disembodied souls, and that the following verses describe his vision of the resurrection.

2. It is, however, remarkable that there is nowhere in the New Testament any reference to *the kind of bodies* possessed by the ungodly after their resurrection. Perhaps the most natural conjecture is that they will resemble those of the godly in being spiritual, and therefore incorruptible. As they sinned in the body they will suffer the consequences of sin in the body. In the body they will come to judgment, and take their natural place on the left hand of him whose grace they have refused.

IV. Relation of the Last Day to Unbelievers

All accounts of the Last Day represent two classes as brought before the Judge. Not all are good; not all are bad; but there are many of each class; far more, without doubt, of the righteous than of the wicked, but nevertheless many of the wicked.

1. And according to the teaching of Christ some of those on his left hand will come from the ranks of his nominal disciples; perhaps being men of mark and exploits. "Many will say to me on that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many miracles? And then will I profess to them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye who work iniquity": Matt. 7: 22-24. Men confident of their claim to the favor of Christ will be

informed at last that they were never, for an hour, recognized by him as disciples, because they were wrong-doers. "Nothing but truth before his throne with honor can appear."

A less boastful but equally unspiritual character is ascribed by Jesus to those on the left hand, according to Matt. 25:44 f., "Then will they also answer, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, or thirsty, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister to thee? Then will he answer them, saying, Verily, I say to you, in as far as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." If one has not love, he has not the wedding garment, and, when reminded of this, may well be speechless.

If the Last Day does nothing more than show every moral being what he has been and is, in the sight of a perfect Judge, it will revive his conscience and make him his own judge.

2. By the decisions of the Last Day some of the wicked will suffer less than others: Luke 12:47, 48; Matt. 11:21-24; Heb. 10:29; Rom. 2:12. But it is not impossible that persons who have hated God less than others in this life may hereafter overtake in wickedness their more guilty companions. If so, their misery will become equal to that of their companions; for no one's accountability ends at the last day. Moral beings will be forever under obligation to do the will of God; and if they refuse to do this, they must forever experience the reproach of conscience for their refusal. Again, impenitence for sin is sin, and must be condemned by conscience as long as this impenitence continues. The same is likewise true of want of love to God, which inevitably passes over into hatred; while hatred of God is hatred of holiness, and must be forever recognized by the moral nature of man as wrong and without excuse. If impenitence continue, punishment will continue; for

it is involved in the constitution of the soul; so of hatred to God, and punishment for the same.

3. But just what will be the result of sin and of woe in the final state, no one of the sacred writers has informed us. Whether the wicked will always seek for more knowledge, or rather, as far as possible, shun the light, can only be conjectured. Preferring to remain the enemies of God, they may, nevertheless, despair of improving their condition, and so make no effort to enter new fields of thought. A sense of shame and of guilt may brood over them, and turn their attention to the past rather than to the future. Opportunities to do evil, except in thought, may be cut off, and their minds be chiefly occupied with what they "might have been," — with what they have lost, and with the conviction that they have no excuse for their sin and folly.

"So I sit alone with my conscience
In the place where the years increase;
And I try to remember the future
In the land where time will cease.

"And I know of the future judgment,
How dreadful soe'er it be,
That to sit alone with my conscience
Will be judgment enough for me."

— *Charles W. Stubbs.*

TEXTUAL INDEX

The heavy-faced figures indicate interpretations of the text referred to.

PAGE

GENESIS

i. 1 *passim* . . 95, 113, 121
i. 26, 27 . . . 145
i. 27 136
ii. *passim* . . 95
ii. 2, 3 . . . 401
ii. 7, 15 f. . . 136
ii. 17 163
iii. 3 160
iv. 13, 14 . . **137**
iv. 17 . . . . **137**
v. 3 . . . . **137**
vi. 1-8 . . . 188
vi. 2 137
vi. 2, 4 . . . **188**
vi. 3 161
vi. 6 104
vi. 7, 8 . . . 136
vii. 21 . . . 136
viii. 1 f. . . . 136
xiv. 20 219 . . 219
xvi. 7, 10, 13 . 187, 206
xvii. 1 . . . 206
xvii. 10-14 . 375, 376
xvii. 10 f. . . 376
xviii. 1-9 . . 189
xviii. 1, 2, 3, 13, 17 206
xviii. 13 f. . . 187
xviii. 14 . . . 110
xviii. 20, 21 . 126
xxi. 33 . . . 114
xxviii. 11, 22 . 206

PAGE

xxviii. 12 . . 192
xxix. 21 f. . . 103
xxx. 1 f. . . 103
xxxi. 11-13 . . 206
xxxi. 40 . . . 181
xxxii. 1, 2 . . 187
xxxii. 25-31 . 206
xli. 26 . . . 387
xlviii. 15, 16 . 206
l. 20 126

EXODUS

iii. *passim* . . 206
iii. 11-iv. 17 . . 74
iii. 14 113
iii. 18 f. . . . 107
iii. 19-21 . . . 126
iv. 17 74
iv. 22 188
viii. 12, 13, 16, 19 127
xii. 11 387
xii. 46 . . . 385
xx. 4 113
xx. 5 105
xx. 5, 6 . . 146, 173
xx. 8 f. . . . 401
xxi. 24, 25 . . 103
xxiii. 7 . . . 319
xxiii. 20, 21 . . 207
xxiii. 20, 23 . . 206
xxix. 36 . . . 259
xxx. 10 . . . 259
xxxi. 3, 6 . . 300
xxxii. 4 . . . 108

PAGE

xxxii. 7 f. . . 337
xxxii. 34 . . . 206
xxxiii. 3, 14 . . 206
xxxiv. 14 . . . 105
xxxv. 31, 35 . . 300

LEVITICUS

i. 4 259
iv. 4, 20, 26, 31, 35 259
v. 1, 17 . . . 257
v. 6, 10, 13, 16, 18 259
vi. 7, 15 . . . 259
viii. 14, 15 . . 259
xi. 45 145
xvi. 16, 18, 20, 30, 33 . . . 259
xvii. 11 . . . 259
xvii. 16 . . . 257
xix. 2 . . . 107, 108
xix. 22 . . . 259
xx. 7 107
xx. 19 257
xxiv. 15 . . . 257
xxvi. 39-46 . . 103

NUMBERS

v. 31 258
viii. 5-22 . . . 370
ix. 12 385
ix. 13 258
xiv. 33, 34 . . 258
xvi. 22 . . . 140

PAGE

xix. 11-22 . . 370
xxi. 28 . . . 181
xxii. 23-27, 32, 33 187
xxiii. 19 . . . 104
xxvii. 16 . . . 140
xxx. 16 . . . 258

DEUTERONOMY

iv. 20 181
iv. 37 206
vi. 5 161
vii. 7, 8 . . . 118
vii. 9, 10 . . . 146
x. 12 . . . 145, 161
x. 17 . . . . **288**
xiv. 1 188
xviii. 18-20, note 74
xix. 21 . . . 103
xxiv. 1-4 . . 101, 103
xxv. 1, 2 times 319
xxx. 6 161
xxx. 10 f. . . 102
xxxii. 4 . . . 108
xxxii. 5 . . . 188
xxxii. 8-14 . . 125
xxxii. 35 . . . 105
xxxii. 40 . . . 114
xxxiii. 2 . 187, 190, 191, 195

JOSHUA

iii. 15, 16 . . 126
x. 11 127

JUDGES

ii. 1-5 207
iii. 10 300
iv. 18-21 . . . 103
v. 24-27 . . . 103
vi. 34 300
ix. 8-16 . . . 91

1 SAMUEL

ii. 2 107
iii. 14 259
vi. 19 . . . . **98**
viii. 15 . . . 92

PAGE

x. 9-13 . . . **412**
xi. 3 187
xi. 6 300
xiii. 13, 14 . . 412
xv. 2, 3 . . . 103
xv. 10 f. . . . 412
xv. 11, 29 . . 104
xvi. 2 103
xvi. 7 288
xvi. 13, 14 . . 412
xvi. 14 . . 193, 300
xvi. 14, 16, 23 . 187
xviii. 10 . . 187, 193
xix. 9 187
xxiii. 10-13 . . 107
xxvi. 16 . . . 107

2 SAMUEL

viii. 4 102
x. 18 102
xii. 31 103
xiv. 17, 20 . . 190
xv. 4 319
xvii. 11 . . . 206
xxii. 47 . . . 219
xxiii. 2 . . . 300
xxiii. 8 . . . 102
xxiv. 1 . . . 127
xxiv. 9 . . . 102
xxiv. 16 . . . 104
xxiv. 24 . . . 102

1 KINGS

iii. 7-12 . . . 300
iv. 29 300
viii. 27 . . . 115
viii. 32 . . . 319
viii. 39 . . . 107
viii. 46 . . 163, 408
viii. 51 . . . 181
ix. 28 102
xix. 5 195
xxii. 21 f. . 187, 193

2 KINGS

iii. 11 365
viii. 11 . . . 103
viii. 26 . . . 102
xxiv. 8 . . . 102

PAGE

1 CHRONICLES

xi. 11 102
xii. 18 . . . 300
xviii. 4 . . . 102
xix. 18 . . . 102
xx. 3 103
xxi. 1, 2 times . 198
xxi. 5 102
xxi. 14-16, 27 . 187
xxi. 25 . . . 102

2 CHRONICLES

vi. 18 115
viii. 18 . . . 102
xix. 7 288
xx. 14 300
xxii. 2 102
xxiv. 20 . . . 300
xxxvi. 9 . . . 102

EZRA

ii. 69 102

NEHEMIAH

vii. 72 102
ix. 6 123

JOB

Passim . . . 109
i. 6 f. . . . 188, 198
i. 6-9 193
ii. 1 f. . . 188, 193
vi. 9 182
vii. 21 . . . 182
viii. 22 . . . 182
x. 12 122
xx. 8 182
xxx. 30 . . . 181
xxxiv. 19 . . . 288
xxxviii. 7. 122, 188, 190
xli. *passim* . . 110

PSALMS

i. *passim* . . . 81
ii. . . 208, 209, 293
v. 10 152

PAGE

vi. 6 181
xi. 7 108
xv. 1 108
xviii. 46 . . . 219
xix. *passim* . . 19
xxi. 10 . . . 181
xxv. 8 118
xxx. 10 . . . 181
xxxi. 10, 11 . . 181
xxxi. 17 . . . 118
xxxiii. 5 . . . 108
xxxiv. 17 . . . 182
xxxvii. 9, 22, 28 182
xxxvii. 10, 36 . 182
xxxvii. 20 . . 181
xxxix. 5 . . . 182
xxxix. 11 . . 181
xl. 14 258
xliv. 26 . . . 118
xlv. . 208, 210, 293
xlv. 7 108
li. 1 320
li. 8-14 . . . 301
lvii. 11 . . . 109
lxvi. 20 . . . 219
lxviii. 18 . 187, 195
lxviii. 20 . . . 219
lxix. 10 . . . 181
lxxii. . 208, **210**, 293
lxxii. 19 . . . 219
lxxiii. 4 . . . 443
lxxiii. 15 . . . 188
lxxvi. 11 . . . 126
lxxxii. 7 . . . 188
lxxxviii. 11-13 . 181
lxxxviii. 17 . . 182
lxxxix. 14, 15 . 146
xc. 2 114
xci. 11, 12 . . 198
xci. 12 . . . 195
xcvii. 2 . . . 108
xcvii. 3 . . . 181
cii. 4 181
cii. 28 113
ciii. 9 118
ciii. 11-13 . . 109
ciii. 20 . . 126, 189
civ. 4 187
civ. 29, 30 . . 123
cx. . 208, 210, 211, 293
cxv. 383
cxv. 17 . . . 181
cxviii. 383

PAGE

cxix. *passim* . 81
cxix. 12 . . . 219
cxxxvi. 1-26 . 109
cxxxvi. 4 . . . 110
cxxxvi. 4-9 . . 118
cxxxix. 2, 11, 12 107
cxxxix. 6 . . 114
cxxxix. 6-12 . 115
cxxxix. 7 . . 113
cxxxix. 16 . . 107
cxlv. 7 . . . 325
cxlv. 9 . . . 109
cxlv. 10 . . . 126
cxlv. 17 . . . 108
cxlviii. 3-9 . . 126

PROVERBS

i. 24 f. . . . 164
xiv. 32 . . . 443
xvi. 4 118
xvi. 4, 9 . . . 116
xvii. 15 . . . 319
xvii. 22 . . . 136
xx. 9 408
xxvi. 4, 5 . . **100**
xxix. 1 . . . 164

ECCLESIASTES

v. 6 187
vii. 20 . . . 163, 408
ix. 10 181
xii. 7 . . . 140, 417
xii. 14 . . . 439

ISAIAH

i. 28 181
v. 23, 2 times . 319
vi. 3 . 107, 108, 190, 192
vi. 5-8 74
vi. 8 f. . . . 294
vii. 14 . . . 93
viii. 11, note . 74
ix. 5, 6 . . . **211**
ix. 6, 7 . . . 293
x. 5-12 . . . 274
xiv. 24 . . . 116
xxxviii. 18, 19 . 181
xl. 17 182
xl. 25 113

PAGE

xl. 26 110
xl. 26, 29 . . . 123
xl. 28 113
xli. 4 114
xli. 11, 12 . . 182
xlii. 8 206
xlii. 9 107
xlii. 19 . . . 187
xliii. 2 . . . 115
xliii. 6, 7 . . . 118
xliii. 9 . . . 319
xliv. 3 . . . 367
xlvi. 10, 11 . . 116
xlviii. 11 . . . 118
xlix. 14-16 . . 109
liii. 5, 6 . . . 274
liii. 8 182
liii. 12 . . . 257
lvii. 16 . . . 140
lix. 17 . . . 105
lx. 21 118
lxi. 1, 2 . . . 300
lxi. 3 118
lxiii. 4 . . . 105
lxiii. 8, 9 . . . 206
lxvi. 1 . . . 115

JEREMIAH

i. 5 107
i. 5-10 74
x. 1 294
x. 24 182
xi. 4 181
xiii. 23 . . 152, 164
xiv. 12 . . . 181
xv. 17, note . . 74
xvi. 17 . . . 107
xviii. 7-10 . 73, 102
xxiii. 23 . . . 115
xxvi. 2 f. . . 102
xxvii. 5 . . . 110
xxxi. 18 . . . 152
xxxi. 33 . . . 294
xxxii. 17 . . . 110
xxxvi. 2, 3 . . 102
li. 57 181

LAMENTATIONS

iii. 33 118
iv. 11 181

PAGE

EZEKIEL

i. 1-ii. 10 . . 74
ii. 10 74
iii. 12 219
iii. 14, note . . 74
iv. 5 257
viii. 1, note . . 74
xi. 5 300
xiv. 10 . . . 257
xvi. 47-52 . . 164
xviii. 19, 20 . . 257
xviii. 23 . . . 109
xviii. 27, 31, 32 153
xviii. 32 . . . 118
xxii. 19-22 . . 181
xxiii. 35 . . . 258
xxxiii. 11 . 109, 118
xxxvi. 26 . . . 152
xxxvi. 25 . . . 370
xxxix. 25 . . . 105

DANIEL

iii. 28, 33 . . 219
vii. 9, 10 . . . 197
vii. 13 227
vii. 13, 14 . . 212
viii. 10 . . . 191
ix. 26 182
x. 5 f., 20, 21 . 196
xii. 1, twice . . 196

HOSEA

ii. 2 188
xii. 4 206

JOEL

i. 4-12 127
i. 18 f. 373
ii. 28-32 . . . 83
iii. 1-5 . . 300, 367

AMOS

iii. 2 164
ix. 2 115

OBADIAH

16 182

PAGE

JONAH

iii. 10 73
iv. 2 . . . 73, 102

MICAH

iii. 8 300
v. 2-5 211

ZECHARIAH

i. 14 105
iii. 1, 2 . . . 193
iv. *passim* . . 296
viii. 19 . . . 395
xii. 1 140
xiii. 2 193
xiv. 5 191

MALACHI

i. 11 385
iii. 1 . 181, 187, 212
iii. 1-24 . . . 207
iii. 6 113
iii. 16 104
iv. 1 181

MATTHEW

i. 1, 21, 25 . . 227
i. 20 195
i. 22, 23 . . . 93
ii. 6 355
ii. 13, 19 . . . 195
iii. 1-11 . . . 313
iii. 5 183
iii. 6 f. . . 380, 381
iii. 6-12 . . . 381
iii. 10 181
iii. 11 f. . . . 380
iii. 16 . . . 235, 244
iii. 16, 17 . . . 296
iii. 17 . . . 110, 216
iv. 1 . . . 198, 244
iv. 1 f. . . . 227
iv. 2 231
v. 17 ff. . . . 57
v. 17, 19 . . . 70
v. 22, 29, 30 . 181
v. 23, 26 . . . 350
v. 37 199

PAGE

v. 44-48 . . . 253
v. 44 f. . . . 342
v. 45 109
v. 48 145
vi 10 198
vi. 12 . . . 320, 408
vi. 13 199
vi. 26-30 . . . 124
vii. 7 f. . . . 337
vii. 11 109
vii. 12 70
vii. 18 152
vii. 21-23 . . . 213
vii. 22, 23, note 414
vii. 22-24 . . . 448
viii. 11 . . . 420
viii. 16 . . . 199
viii. 20 . . . 227
viii. 27 . . . 372
viii. 28 . . . 198
viii. 28-34 . . 58
ix. 2-6 213
ix. 4 58
ix. 6 227
ix. 20 306
ix. 26 237
ix. 32 198
ix. 33, 35 . . 372
ix. 34 . . . 198, 199
x. 1 193
x. 1, 8 199
x. 6, 42 . . . 181
x. 8 213
x. 15 164
x. 17-22 . . . 59
x. 19, 20 . . . 63
x. 21 423
x. 28 . 117, 132, 142, 181, 417
x. 32, 33 . . 213, 316
x. 32, 37, 38 . 349
xi. 5 213
xi. 11 379
xi. 19 318
xi. 21 60
xi. 21-24 . . . 449
xi. 22 164
xi. 25 . . . 373, 375
xi. 27-56 . 110, 213, 237 (3 times), 239
xi. 28 153
xi. 28-30 . . . 125
xi. 29 . . . 57, 327

PAGE

xii. 22 198
xii. 23 227
xii. 24 199
xii. 25 . . . 216, 231
xii. 26 199
xii. 26-29 . . . 187
xii. 27 199
xii. 30 316
xii. 32 . . . . **446**
xii. 36, 37 . . 439
xii. 37 . . 318, 319
xii. 40 59
xii. 45 193
xiii. 19, 38 . . 199
xiii. 25 . . . 199
xiii. 37, 38 . . 310
xiii. 39 . . 193, 199
xiii. 39-43, 49, 50 437
xiii. 40 . . . 181
xiii. 41 . . . 160
xiii. 41-43 . . 213
xiii. 42, 50 . . 181
xiv. 18-21 . . 213
xv. 24 . . . 181
xv. 28 199
xv. 30, 31 . . 213
xvi. 16 . . 216, 349
xvi. 17-19 . . 65
xvi. 17, 27 . . 213
xvi. 21 . . 252, 423
xvi. 21-23 . . 59
xvi. 27 . . 220, 294
xvi. 31 . . . 355
xvii. 5 . . . 216
xvii. 14 . . . 372
xvii. 15 f. . . 198
xvii. 22, 23 . . 59
xvii. 23 . . . 423
xvii. 27 . . . 231
xviii. 3 . . . 164
xviii. 8, 9 . . 181
xviii. 10 . . 126, 190, 191, **196**
xviii. 15 f. . . 346
xviii. 15-17 . . 350
xviii. 17 . . 347, 348
xviii. 19 . . . 337
xviii. 19, 20 . . 396
xviii. 20 . . 126, 213
xix. 3-9 . . . 101
xix. 3, 28 . . 372
xix. 8, 9 . . . 57

PAGE

xix. 13-15 . . 377
xix. 14 . . . 164
xix. 17 . . . 58
xix. 22 . . . 373
xix. 25 . . . 372
xix. 26 . . . 110
xix. 28 . 372, 434, 439
xix. 28, 29 . . 213
xx. 17-19, 22, 23 59
xx. 19 . . . 423
xx. 23 . . . 59
xx. 28 . 162, 246, 253, 260, 274
xxi. 9 227
xxi. 10, 20 . . 372
xxi. 15 . . . 60
xxi. 18 f. . . . 231
xxi. 22 . . . 337
xxi. 42 . . 60, 70
xxii. 27 . . . 385
xxii. 16 . . 288, 372
xxii. 29 . . . 70
xxii. 29-33 . . **91**
xxii. 30 . 120, 190, 198
xxii. 36-40 . . 70
xxii. 37 . . 133, 145
xxii. 37-39 . . 161
xxii. 39 . . . **146**
xxiii. 8 . . . 348
xxiii. 33 . . . 181
xxiii. 37 . . . 278
xxiv. 2, 4, 5, 23-26 59
xxiv. 22 . . . 227
xxiv. 31 . . . 187
xxiv. 34 . . . **59**
xxiv. 36 . . . 190
xxiv. 50, 51 . . 182
xxv. 1-13 . . 412
xxv. 10 . . . 385
xxv. 14-30, 31-46 437
xxv. 21, 23 . . 439
xxv. 31 . . . 220
xxv. 31 f. . . 213
xxv. 31-46 . 294, 439
xxv. 32 . . . 439
xxv. 34 . . . 116
xxv. 34-40 . . 342
xxv. 41 . 181, 199, 193, 194
xxv. 41-46, note 414
xxv. 44 f. . . 449

PAGE

xxvi. 1, 2 . . 59
xxvi. 8 . . . 372
xxvi. 26-29 . 383, 385
xxvi. 28 . . . 321
xxvi. 31 . . . 455
xxvi. 31-34 . . 59
xxvi. 31-35 . . 213
xxvi. 37 . . . 227
xxvi. 38 . . . 231
xxvi. 39 . . . 162
xxvi. 41 . . . 132
xxvi. 53 . 187, 192, 197
xxvi. 54 . . . 252
xxvi. 54, 56 . . 70
xxvi. 64 . . . 227
xxviii. 18 . . . 213
xxviii. 19 . 294, 295, 305, 310, 313, 314, 349, 368, 372 f.
xxviii. 19-20 . 59
xxviii. 20 . . 115

MARK

i. 4 319
i. 4 f. . . . 380, 381
i. 4, 5 . 183, 313, 381
i. 7 f. 380
i. 9 361
i. 24 191
i. 34, 39 . . . 199
ii. 4, 8 365
ii. 5-12 . . . 213
ii. 8 . . . 58, 216
ii. 10, 11 . . . 60
ii. 27 401
iii. 6-12 . . . 381
iii. 11 193
iii. 24 199
iii. 29 . . . . **180**
v. 1 191
v. 3 f. 199
vi. 7, 12, 13 . . 213
vi. 41, 44 . . . 213
vii. 2, 4, 8 . . 365
viii. 17 . . . 216
viii. 31 . . 252, 423
viii. 38 . . 57, 220
ix. 7 216
ix. 9 227
ix. 12 182
ix. 14-28 . . . 199

PAGE

ix. 18 199
ix. 20, 25 . . . 187
ix. 31 423
ix. 43-48 . . . 181
ix. 48 274
x. 13-16 . . . 377
x. 14 164
x. 18 408
x. 34 423
x. 38, 39 . . 59, 369
x. 45 . . . 260, 274
xi. 2-6 213
xi. 12-14 . . . 58
xii. 11 60
xii. 14 288
xii. 25 191
xii. 30 133
xii. 32 . 190, 231, 244
xii. 36 300
xii. 40 181
xii. 55 227
xiii. 11 . . . 63
xiii. 14 . . . 59
xiii. 19 . . . 121
xiii. 31 . . 56, 57
xiii. 32 . 190, 231, **244**
xiv. 13-16 . . 59
xiv. 18-21, 72 . 59
xiv. 22-25 . 383, 385
xiv. 27-31 . . 213
xiv. 38 . . . 132
xiv. 62 . . . 213
xvi. 6 313
xvi. 15, 16 . . 305
xvi. 16 . 322, 372, 376

LUKE

i. 11 f. . . . 195
i. 15-17 . . . 207
i. 19 . 187, 191, 197
i. 32, 33 . . . 293
i. 32, 35 . . . 216
i. 35 242
i. 37 110
i. 47 133
i. 67 300
i. 68 219
i. 77 319
ii. 13 f. . . 190, 197
ii. 45 373
ii. 52 . 227, 231, 244

PAGE

iii. 3 319
iii. 3 f. . . 380, 381
iii. 6 227
iii. 7-14 . . . 381
iii. 8 313
iii. 15 f. . . . 380
iii. 18 379
iv. 1 . . . 235, 244
iv. 18 300
iv. 21 70
iv. 33, 35, 36, 41 187
v. 20-26 . . . 213
vi. 18 199
vi. 35 372
vii. 11-17 . . . 213
vii. 21 . . . 187, 199
vii. 29, 35 . . 318
vii. 30 380
viii. 2 . . . 187, 193
viii. 10 . . . 91
viii. 11 f. . 310, 412
viii. 12 . . 193, 198
viii. 28, 29 . . 199
viii. 31 . . . 193
viii. 41-56 . . 213
ix. 1, 2 . . . 213
ix. 22 . 227, 252, 423
ix. 26 . . . 57, 213
ix. 39 199
ix. 42 193
ix. 44 59
ix. 55 135
x. 22 213
x. 27, 28 . . . 161
x. 29 318
xi. 13 337
xi. 14 198
xi. 18 199
xi. 38 . . . . **365**
xi. 49 70
xi. 51 181
xii. 1 387
xii. 7 109
xii. 8, 9 . . . 191
xii. 11, 12 . . 63
xii. 22 f. . . . 132
xii. 47, 48 . . 449
xii. 48 164
xii. 50 . . 59, 369
xiii. 1-5 . . . 109
xiii. 33 . 59, 181, 252
xiv. 14 . . . 426

PAGE

xiv. 26, 27, 33 . 316
xv. 4, 6, 8, 9, 17, 25, 32 . . . 181
xv. 10 187
xvi. 15 . . 107, 318
xvi. 16 . . . 382
xvi. 16 f. . . . 439
xvi. 17 . . . 70
xvi. 19 . . . 142
xvi. 19-31 . . 181
xvi. 22 f. . . . 410
xvi. 22 . . . 192
xvi. 23 f. . . . 420
xvi. 23, 24 . . 181
xvi. 23-26 . . 444
xvii. 22, 25 . . 59
xviii. 13 . . . 258
xviii. 14 . . 318, 319
xviii. 15-17 . . 377
xviii. 16 . . . 164
xviii. 33 . . . 423
xix. 10 . . 181, 253
xix. 12 f. . . . 434
xix. 16 f. . . . 439
xix. 17-19 . . 439
xix. 30-34 . . 213
xx. 3 380
xx. 21 288
xx. 24 f. . . . 426
xx. 34-38 . **91, 430**
xx. 36 . . . 187, 188
xx. 41 227
xxi. 12, 16, 20 f. 59
xxi. 33 . . . 57
xxii. 19, 20 . . 383
xxii. 26 . . . 355
xxii. 30 . . . 439
xxii. 37 . . . 252
xxii. 43 . . . 192
xxii. 69, 70 . . 213
xxiii. 41 . . . 313
xxiii. 43 . 181, 400, 417, 420 (2 times)
xxiv. 4 . . . 188
xxiv. 16 . . . 70
xxiv. 7, 26, 44, 46 252
xxiv. 19 . . . 227
xxiv. 21 . . . 260
xxiv. 28 . . . 58
xxiv. 31 . . . 260
xxiv. 39 . . . 187
xxiv. 44 . . 69, 70

PAGE

xxiv. 46 . . . 70
xxiv. 47 . . 319, 321
xxiv. 49 . . . 300

JOHN

i. 1 . . . 110, **221** f. (3 times)
i 2 . . . . . **121**
i. 3 221
i. 3, 4 23
i. 4 224
i. 4, 5 221
i. 6, 14 221
i. 7 291
i. 9, 14, 16 . . 221
i. 13 . 161, 264, 294, 301
i. 14 . 227, **234, 291,** 418
i. 14, 16 . . . 58
i. 14, 18 . . . 221
i 14, 50 . . . 221
i. 17 70
i. 18 . . . 221, **225**
i. 22 f. 382
i. 27 f. 380
i. 29 274
i. 29 f., 36 . . 380
i. 30 227
i. 35-49 . . . 382
ii. 18-21 . . . 423
ii. 19 418
ii. 19-22 . . . 59
ii. 23 60
ii. 24, 25 . . 58, 221
ii. 25 231
iii. 2 60
iii. 3, 5-8 . . . 301
iii. 3-7 375
iii. 3-8 301
iii. 5 . **314** f., 349
iii. 5, 6 . . . 294
iii. 6 . 142, 161, 163
iii. 10 126
iii. 11 . . . 56, 230
iii. 11-13 . . . 56
iii. 13 . **114,** 213, 214, 215, 231
iii. 14 252
iii. 16 . 109, 118, 270, 275, 318

PAGE

iii. 16, 17 . 246, 253, 278
iii. 16-18, 35, 36 221
iii. 16, 36 . . . 146
iii. 17, 34 . . . 207
iii. 19 . . . 163, 164
iii. 23 . . . 361, 362
iii. 25 f. . . . 380
iii. 34 . . . 235, 244
iii. 34, 35 . . . 110
iii. 36 322
iv. 1 349
iv. 1, 2 . . . 382
iv. 14 . . . 83, 180
iv. 22 . . . 56, 230
iv. 24 . . . 113, 222
iv. 34 . 57, 110, 270
v. *passim* . . . 214
v. 5, 12, 20 . . 327
v. 6 221
v. 17 401
v. 17-27, 36, 43 **213, 214**
v. 17, 19, 20, 21, 26 239
v. 19 296
v. 19, 20, 36 . . **236**
v. 19, 21 . . . 237
v. 19, 28-30 . . 276
v. 20 . . . 56, 237
v. 22, 23, 27 . 237
v. 22, 27, 29 . . 439
v. 25-29 . . . 303
v. 26 . . . 107, 113
v. 27 . . . 227, 440
v. 28, 29 . . . 426
v. 29 . 433, 437, 447
v. 30 . 57, 110, 162
v. 36 207
v. 36, 37 . . . 60
v. 39 70
vi. 29, 57 . . . 207
vi. 35 294
vi. 38 57
vi. 38, 50, 51, 62 213
vi. 39 181
vi. 40 . . . 213, 322
vi. 40, 44, 54 . 437
vi. 44 303
vi. 44, 65 . . . 152
vi. 46 56
vi. 48 224
vi. 51, 53, 54 . 384

PAGE

vi. 54 . . . 327, 426
vi. 61, 64 . . . 221
vi. 64 58
vi. 64, 70 . . . 412
vii. 16 56
vii. 18 . . . 57, 162
vii. 28, 29 . . 56
vii. 29 207
vii. 38 70
vii. 38, 39 . 64, 65, 83
vii. 39 236
viii. 28 . . . 56
viii. 29 . . . 56
viii. 36 . . . 293
viii. 38 . . . 56
viii. 40 . . . **226** f.
viii. 44 . . . 193 (2 times)
viii. 50 . . . 162
viii. 55 . . . 56
viii. 58 . 114, 214, 215, 221, 231, 237, 239
ix. 4 . 56, 230, 252
x. *passim* . . . 214
x. 11 f. . . . 355
x. 11, 14, 15 . 125
x. 11, 15 . . . 270
x. 14, 17, 18 . 423
x. 15 56
x. 27, 28 . . . 293
x. 28 181
x. 28-30 . . 239, 414 (note)
x. 30-38 . . . 56
x. 35 70
x. 37, 38 . **213,** 214 ff.
xi. 5, 33, 35 . . 231
xi. 13, 14 . . . 221
xi. 24 f. . . 426, 433
xi. 25 . 46, 214, 224
xi. 25, 26 . . . **430**
xi. 33, 35 . . . 227
xi. 43 303
xi. 51 300
xii. 6 412
xii. 7, 23, 32-34 59
xii. 14 f. . . . 70
xii. 24, 27, 32, 33 252
xii. 24, 32 . . 423
xii. 24, 32, 33 . 59

PAGE

xii. 25 . . . 162
xii. 31 . . . . 199 (2 times)
xii. 32 . . . 303
xii. 34 . . . 252
xii. 35, 36, 45, 46 214
xii. 48 57
xii. 49 . . . 56
xiii. 2 . . . 193, 198
xiii. 4-13 . . . 57
xiii. 10 . . . 361
xiii. 11, 18-26 . 59
xiii. 18 . . . 70
xiii. 18, 19 . . 412
xiv. 1 . . . 332
xiv. 6 56, 180, 214, 224, 262, 294, 327, 387
xiv. 9 . 214, 239, 293, 327
xiv. 10 . . . 235
xiv. 10-24 . . 56
xiv. 13 . . . 332
xiv. 15-17, 26 . 63
xiv. 16 . 65, 294, 295
xiv. 16-21 . . 330
xiv. 16, 26 . 180, 262
xiv. 23 . 56, 57, 230
xiv. 26 . 64 (2 times), 264, 300
xiv. 30 . . . 199 (2 times)
xv. 1, 4 . . . 294
xv. 1-6 . . 330, 412
xv. 5 . 152, 327, 387
xv. 6 181
xv. 7 57
xv. 13 . . . 275
xv. 16 332
xv. 22, 24 . . 164
xv. 26 . 64, 262, 294, 295 (2 times), 300
xv. 26, 27 . . 63
xvi. 7 f. . . . 435
xvi. 7, 8, 13 . . 295
xvi. 7-11 . . 59, 199 (2 times)
xvi. 7, 13-15 . 64
xvi. 7-15 . 63, 294, 295
xvi. 8-11 . . . 65
xvi. 8-12 . . . 301

PAGE

xvi. 8-15 . . . 262
xvi. 11 . . . 199
xvi. 13 . . . 300
xvi. 14, 15 . . 64 (2 times)
xvi. 15 . . 214, 215
xvi. 23 . . . 327
xvi. 23, 24 . . 262 (2 times), 332
xvi. 30 . . . 58
xvii. 2 227
xvii. 3 . . . . **114**
xvii. 3, 8, 21 . 207
xvii. 4 . . . . **276**
xvii. 5 213
xvii. 5, 24 . . 120
xvii. 8 . . . 56
xvii. 10 . . 118, 214
xvii. 10-12 . . 56
xvii. 10-22 . . 56
xvii. 11, 12, note 414
xvii. 11, 21, 22 . 56
xvii. 12 . . 70, 181, 412
xvii. 15 . . . 199
xvii. 24 . . . **110**
xviii. 4 . . . 58
xviii. 9 . . . 412
xviii. 36 . . . 293
xix. 11 . . 164, 274
xix. 24, 36 . . 70
xix. 28-30 . . 276
xix. 36 . . . 385
xx. 9 252
xx. 21 126
xx. 22, 23 . 64, 65
xx. 26, 27, 28 . 180
xx. 28 . . 221, **223**
xx. 29 435
xxi. 16 . . . 355
xxi. 17 . . 58, 231
xxi. 18 . . 34, 59

ACTS

i. 2 . . . **235**, 244
i. 4, 5 367
i. 5, 8 64
i. 10 188
i. 16, 20 . . . 70
i. 21 f. . . . 351
i. 23 348

PAGE

i. 24 . . . 58, 333
ii. 4, 6, 7 . . . 65
ii. 15-21 . . . 83
ii. 16 f. . . . 300
ii. 16, 23, 25, 30, 31 70
ii. 17 227
ii. 17, 18 . . . 68
ii. 17, 18, 33 . 367
ii. 17, 21 . . 64, 65
ii. 21 333
ii. 22 . . . . **236**
ii. 23 . 116, 245, 252, 274
ii. 24 f. . . . 425
ii. 27 132
ii. 33 . 262, 293, 294
ii. 37 305
ii. 37-41 . . . 313
ii. 38 . 319, 321, 368
ii. 38, 41 . . . 373
ii. 41 . . . 349, **365**
ii. 41, 42 . . . 392
ii. 42 385
iii. 15 f. . . . 425
iii. 16 323
iii. 18, 21 . . 252
iii. 18, 21-26 . 70
iii. 19 153
iii. 19-21 . . 59, 67
iii. 38 368
iv. 4 . . . . **365**
iv. 10 425
iv. 10-12 . . . 252
iv. 12 262
iv. 15 348
iv. 24, 27 . . . 209
iv. 25 70
iv. 27, 28 . . 116
v. 3, 4 . . 110, 295
v. 7 385
v. 11 347
v. 19 . . . 126, 195
v. 20, 30 . . . 425
v. 31 319
v. 34 108
v. 36 . . . **98**, 182
vi. 1 ff. . . . **353**
vi. 3 . . . 348, 351
vi. 3, 4, 5 . . 348
vii. 38 347
vii. 51 296
vii. 53 195

PAGE

vii. 56 227
vii. 59 . . . 332, 417
viii. 1 347
viii. 12 . . 313, 376
viii. 12, 13 . 349, 373
viii. 14-17 . . 65
viii. 16 . . . 368
viii. 26 . . . 195
viii. 36-39 . . 364
viii. 38, 39 . . 361
viii. 40 . . . 359
ix. 14, 21 . . 332
ix. 15 285
ix. 18 373
ix. 31 347
ix. 39 361
x. 22 191
x. 34, 35 . . . 288
x. 36, 37 . . . 382
x. 36, 42 . . . 217
x. 38 . . . 236, 300
x. 40 425
x. 41, 42 . . . 294
x. 43 . . . 70, 319
x. 44-47 . . . 373
x. 44-48 . . . 314
xi. 3 ff. . . . 376
xi. 22, 26 . . . 347
xi. 27, 28 . . 68
xi. 29, 30 . . . 352
xi. 30 . . . 355, 356
xii. 1, 5 . . . 347
xii. 7 . . . 187, 195
xii. 15 . . . **196** (2 times)
xiii. 1 . . . 347, 355
xiii. 1-3 . . . 358
xiii. 2, 3 . . . 351
xiii. 2, 4 . . . 296
xiii. 9-11 . . . 65
xiii. 33 . . . 209
xiii. 38, 39 . . 319
xiii. 39 . . . 318
xiii. 48 . . . 285
xiv. 3, 8-10 . . 65
xiv. 23 . 346, 355, 356, 391
xiv. 23, 27 . . 347
xiv. 26, 27 . . 351
xiv. 26-28 . . 346
xv. 1 376
xv. 2 . . . 348, 351
xv. 2, 3 . . . 346

PAGE

xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23 355
xv. 3, 4, 22, 41 . 347
xv. 17 373
xv. 18 116
xv. 19 323
xv. 22 355
xv. 27 373
xv. 37, 39 . . 67
xvi. 3 376
xvi. 4 355
xvi. 5 347
xvi. 7 297
xvi. 8 391
xvi. 14 . . . 304
xvi. 14, 15, 31, 33 373
xvi. 14, 31-33 . 313
xvi. 15 . . . 377
xvi. 15, 33, 34 . 376
xvi. 30 . . . 305
xvi. 31 . . . 322
xvi. 33 . . . 361
xvii. 24 . . . 113
xvii. 26 . 116, 135, 136 f., 146
xvii. 26, 27 . 113, 125
xvii. 27, 28 . . 115
xvii. 28 . . 22, 123
xvii. 31 . 227, 294, 437, 439
xviii. 8 . 313, 373, 376, 377
xviii. 22 . . . 347
xviii. 24-28 . . 382
xix. 1 f. . . . 380
xix. 4 . . . . 380 (2 times)
xix. 5 368
xix. 6 65
xix. 11, 12 . . 65
xix. 12, 15 . . 187
xix. 12-16 . . 193
xix. 15 . . . 191
xix. 32, 39, 41 . 347
xx. 7 . . . 391, 401
xx. 7, 11 . . . 385
xx. 17 . . . 346, 355
xx. 17, 28 . 347, 354
xx. 24 318
xx. 28 . 219, 346, 347 (note), 355 (2 times), 356

PAGE

xx. 29, 30, 31, 37, 38 . . . 373
xxi. 8 359
xxi. 9 68
xxi. 11 . . 297, 300
xxi. 18 . . . 355
xxi. 20 . . . 376
xxii. 14, 15 . . 424
xxii. 16 . 314, 315, 333, **361**, 370, 373
xxiii. 3-5 . . . 66
xxiv. 15 . 426, 433, 447
xxiv. 18 . 304, 319, 323
xxvi. 20 . . 313, 381
xxvii. 22-25, 31 412
xxviii. 25 . 294, 296

ROMANS

i. 1 65
i. 3 . . 49, 219, 227
i. 3, 4, 9 . . 217
i. 4 . . . 302, 424
i. 7 217
i. 17 . . . 317, 323
i. 18 f. . . . **161**
i. 19, 20 . . . 307
i. 20 113
i. 25 219
i. 32 168
ii. 4 325
ii. 4, 6 146
ii. 6 440
ii. 11 288
ii. 12 . 164, 183, 449
ii. 12-16 . . . 437
ii. 13 . . . 108, 318
ii. 13, 16 . . . 319
ii. 18, 20 . . . 80
ii. 25 160
ii. 28, 29 . . . 132
iii. 2, 19, 21 . 82, 103
iii. 4 . 4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30, 318, 322
iii. 5 105
iii. 9 163
iii. 20 228
iii. 21-30 . . . 317
iii. 22, 25, 28 . 322, 323

PAGE

iii. 24 . 260, 318, 319
iii. 24, 25 . 320, 321
iii. 25 . 258, 260, 275
iii. 25, 26 . **254**, 274
iii. 26 . . . 201, 291
iii. 28 323
iii. 30, 31 . . 323
iv. 1 161
iv. 2, 5 . . . 318
iv. 4, 16 . . . 318
iv. 5 317
iv. 5, 13, 14 . 322
iv. 6-8 . . . 319
iv. 7, 8 . . . 260
iv. 15 164
iv 15 164
iv. 16 323
iv. 25 424
v. 1 . . . 322, 323
v. 1, 6 318
v. 1, 11 . . . 324
v. 2 323
v. 3 f. . . . 325
v. 5 . . . 126, 301
v. 6 264
v. 9 319
v. 9, 18, 19 . . 320
v. 10 424
v. 11 248
v. 12 . 137, 142, 163 (2 times), **171, 172, 173, 174**
v. 13 . . . 160, 164
v. 15 . . . 226, 318
v. 17 439
v. 19 . . . **183**, 228
vi. 1, 14, 20 . . 320
vi. 2 315
vi. 2-14 . . . 302
vi. 3 . . . 369, 374
vi. 3-5 . . **362**, 374
vi. 4 369
vi. 4, 5, 8, 11, 13 302
vi. 6 409
vi. 7 318
vi. 11 294
vi. 15, 17, 22 . 325
vi. 19 160
vii. 5, 7, 9 . . 320
vii. 7-12 . . . 70
vii. 8, 14, 18, 23, 24 161
vii. 12 . . 82, 108

PAGE

viii. 3 . 227, **242** f., 248
viii. 3, 29, 32 . 217
viii. 68 . . . 161
viii. 7 . . . . **164**
viii. 8-10 . . . 330
viii. 9 . 217 (2 times), 294, 297
viii. 10-13 . . 408
viii. 13 . . . 330
viii. 14 ff. . 141, 329
viii. 15, 26, 27, 32 262
viii. 17, 30, 31, 32 324
viii. 23 . . 260, 261
viii. 24, 25 . . 309
viii. 26 . . 126, **329**
viii. 26, 27 . . 262
viii. 27 . . 107, 110
viii. 28 . 116, 325, 329
viii. 28, 30 . 284, 303, 414 (note)
viii. 29, 30 . . 302
viii. 30 . . . 319
viii. 30, 33 . 317, 318
viii. 32 . . 253, 293
viii. 33, 34 . 252, 319
viii. 34 . . . 294
viii. 35-39, note 414
viii. 38 . . . 197
ix. 4 82
ix. 5 . . **218, 219**
ix. 11 . . . 116, **283**
ix. 11, 24 . . 284
ix. 25 71
ix. 30, 32 . . 323
x. 3 317
x. 6 323
x. 9 315
x. 17 310
x. 17, 18 . . 305, 307
xi. 5, 6 . . . 318
xi. 20 323
xi. 25 67
xi. 25, 32 . . . 183
xi. 36 118
xii. 3 329
xii. 4 f. . . . 353
xii. 5 294
xii. 6-8 . . . 300
xii. 7 f. . . . 353

PAGE

xii. 8 355
xii. 19 . . . 105
xii. 20 f. . . . 70
xiii. 4 444
xiv. 1 348
xiv. 5 399
xiv. 7 162
xiv. 9 293
xiv. 9, 10 . . 439
xiv. 10 . . 294, 439
xiv. 12 . . . 183
xiv. 23 . . . 323
xv. 3 162
xv. 16 301
xv. 18, 19, 29 . 217
xv. 25 . . . 373
xv. 30 . . . 296
xvi. 1 359
xvi. 12 . . . 353
xvi. 1, 4, 16, 23 347
xvi. 20 . . . 217
xvi. 17 . . . 394

1 CORINTHIANS

i. 1 . . . . 65, 217
i. 2 . . 218, 333, 347
i. 3 218
i. 3, 4 253
i. 4 318
i. 10 394
i. 14-15 . . . 314
i. 14-16 . . . 67
i. 16 . . . 376, 377
i. 17, 18, 21 . . 314
i. 21 372
i. 23 270
i. 23, 24 . 262, 292, 293
i. 24 303
i. 26 161
i. 26, 30 . . . 118
i. 30 . . . 260, 321
ii. 2 . . . 292, 293
ii. 6 f. . . . 65
ii. 7 116
ii. 8, 16 . . . 218
ii. 10 110
ii. 10, 11 . . . 294
ii. 11 . . . . **298**
ii. 13, 14, 15 . 329
iii. 1-4 . . . 161
iii. 5 329

PAGE

iii. 10 65
iii. 13 437
iii. 15 181
iii. 16 . . . 83, 330
iii. 16, 17 . . 205, 295
iii. 21, 22 . . . 325
iii. 22, 23 . . . 118
iv. 4 318
iv. 5 . . . 217, 437
iv. 15 . 301, 310, 314, 375
iv. 17 . . . 346, 347
v. 1-13 . . 346, 350
v. 3, 5 132
v. 4 217
v. 5-13 . . 349, 385
v. 7, 8 . 383, 384, 385
v. 13 . . . 348, 350
vi. 2 . . . 434, 439
vi. 4 347
vi. 9, 10 183
vi. 11 . . . 318, 361
vi. 13 427
vi. 14 426
vi. 16 132
vi. 19 . . . 295, 330
vi. 20 . . . 118, 260
vii. 12 . . 130, 217
vii. 14 . 163, **371**, 377
vii. 15 346
vii. 17 347
vii. 19 181
vii. 23 260
vii. 34 132
viii. 4 . . 181, **200**
viii. 6 217
viii. 11 . . . . **412**
viii. 12 348
ix. 1 . . . . 65, 424
ix. 14 cf. 7-11 . 346, 353
ix. 31 347
x. 1-6 71
x. 4 . . 49, **207** f.
x. 15-21 . . 384, 390
x. 16 384
x. 16, 17 . . 385, 390
x. 20, 21 . . . . **200**
x 21, 22 218
x. 22 105
x. 24, 33 162
x. 28 77
x. 31 118

PAGE

x. 32 347
xi. 4 68
xi. 16, 18, 22 . 347
xi. 18-34 . . . . **390**
xi. 23-25 . . 383, 387
xi. 23, 26 . . . 49
xi. 24-26 . . 384, 385
xi. 27 218
xi. 27-29 . . 385, 388
xi. 32 325
xii. *passim* . . 65
xii. 3, 9 329
xii. 4-6 . . 110, 296
xii. 5-11, 28-31 . 84
xii. 5, 6 . . . . **297**
xii. 8 65
xii. 8-11 296
xii. 11 . . 65, 296
xii. 12 . . 294, 346
xii. 12, 27 . . . 49
xii. 12 f. . . 348, 353
xii. 12 ff., 28 . 358
xii. 27 . . 49, 294
xii. 28 . . 300, 347 (note), 353
xii. 28, 29 . . 355
xiii. *passim* . . 65
xiii. 5 162
xiv. *passim* . . 65
xiv. 1-25 84
xiv. 4-35 . . 347
xiv. 12 135
xiv. 15 329
xiv. 18, 19 . . 65
xiv. 20 164
xiv. 24-32 . . 68
xiv. 28 77
xiv. 33, 40 . . 346
xiv. 34-36 . . 346
xv. 3 321
xv. 3-8 424
xv. 3-58 426
xv. 3-11 49
xv. 9, note . . 347
xv. 21 226
xv. 21, 22 . . 137
xv. 21, 22, 45 . 163
xv. 22 142
xv. 23, 24 . . 433
xv. 24, 25 . . 217
xv. 25 194
xv. 28 22
xv. 28, 29 . . 183

PAGE

xv. 35, 36, 38 . 426
xv. 36-38 . . **430** f.
xv. 42-54 . . 427, 430
xv. 44 . . **133, 427**
xv. 44, 46, 49, 53, 54 . . . 142
xv. 51, 52 . 431, 436
xv. 51-54 . . 59
xv. 56, 57 . . 443
xv. 58 373
xvi. 1, 2 . . . 346
xvi. 1, 19 . . 347
xvi. 2 401
xvi. 15, 17 . . 376
xvi. 22 . . . 183
xvi. 23 . . . 217

2 CORINTHIANS

i. 2 217
i. 3 219
i. 12 161
i. 19 217
i. 24 323
ii. 6 . . . 349, 352
ii. 12, 13 . . . 391
ii. 15 325
iii. 16 330
iii. 17 217
iii. 18 330
iv. 2 ff. . . . 58
iv. 4, 2 times . 199
iv. 4, 5 . . . 217
iv. 10, 11 . . . 294
iv. 13 329
iv. 14 426
iv. 15 . . . 118, 325
iv. 17 . . . 325, 346
iv. 17, 18 . . 309
v. 1 418
v. 2 418
v. 7 323
v. 8 . . . . 410, 420
v. 10 . 217, 437, 439, 440
v. 10, 15 . . . 294
v. 14 . 254, 255, 270
v. 14, 21 . . 49, 274
v. 15 . 162, 293, 302
v. 17 . . . 294, 303
v. 18, 19 . . . 253
v. 20 . . . 217, 293
v. 20, 21 . . . 292

PAGE

v. 21 . 49, 254, **255**, **256**, 317, 321
vi. 14 160
vi. 16 295
vi. 18 110
vi. 20 293
vii. 1 132
vii. 15 346
vii. 17 346
viii. *passim* . . 352
viii. 9 253
ix. *passim* . . 352
x. 8 217
xi. 14 . 60, 191, 198
xi. 16 . . . 34, 349
xi. 31 . . . 217, 219
xii. 2, 3 . . . 67
xii. 7 199
xii. 8 218
xii. 11 182
xii. 12 ff. . 346, 391
xiii. 11 . . . 109
xiii. 13 . . 294, 296
xiii. 14 . . . 217
xiv. 33, 40 . . 346

GALATIANS

i. 3 . . . 217, 347
i. 4 321
i. 13, note . . 347
i. 15 . . . . **285**
i. 16 228
ii. 5 58
ii. 6 288
ii. 6-9 65
ii. 10 352
ii. 11 408
ii. 11-13 . . . 66
ii. 12 f. . . . 376
ii. 16 . . . 322, 323
ii. 16, 17 . . . 318
ii. 16-20 . . 322, 323
ii. 19, 20 . . . 302
ii. 20 . 118, 217, 253, 275, 293, 294
ii. 23-24 . . . 70
iii. 1 292
iii. 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 24 323
iii. 6 f. . . 322, 375
iii. 7, 26 . . . 375
iii. 8 . . . 71, 317

PAGE

iii. 8, 11, 24 . . 318
iii. 10 294
iii. 10, 13 . . 254, **256**
iii. 13 . 49, 260, 274, 320, 321
iii. 16 . . . **91**, **92**
iii. 16, 17, 28 . 275
iii. 19 . . . 195, 320
iii. 22 322
iii. 23, 24 . . 70
iii. 26 188
iii. 26 f. . . 348, 375
iii. 27 374
iii. 28 92
iv. 4 . . 23, 49, 203, 217, 228, 234
iv. 4, 5 . . . 246
iv. 5, 6 . . . 188
iv. 6 f. . 141, 217, 294, 297, 329
iv. 7 348
iv. 9, 10 . . . 399
iv. 19 301
iv. 21-31 . . . 71
v. 5 323
v. 12 394
v. 15 181
v. 16 161
v. 17 . . . 330, 408
v. 19-20 . . . 330
v. 19-21 . . . 183
v. 22 . . . 126, 329
vi. 3 182
vi. 6 . . . 346, 353
vi. 7-10 . . . 440
vi. 10 348
vi. 15 303
vi. 18 217

EPHESIANS

i. 2 217
i. 3-6, note . . 414
i. 4 120
i. 4, 5, 9, 11 . . 284
i. 5 118
i. 6, 7 318
i. 7 . 253, 260, 319, 320, 321
i. 10 193
i. 10, 21, 22 . 194, **275**
i. 10, 21-23 . . 246
i. 10, 22, 23 . . 245

PAGE

i. 11 113
i. 11-14, note . 414
i. 14 296
i. 17 . . . 260, 329
i. 21 197
i. 21, 22 217
i. 22, note . . 347
i. 22, 23 . . . 293
ii. 3 163
ii. 4 . . . 118, 253
ii. 5, 6 . . . 302
ii. 7, 8 318
ii. 8 322
ii. 8-10 . . . 118
ii. 10 . 152, 294, 303
ii. 18 f. . . . 348
ii. 18-20 . . . 110
ii. 20 f. . . 65, 108, 217
ii. 22 . 295, 296, 330
iii. 10 . 190, 197, 246, 275, 347 (note)
iii. 15 197
iii. 16, 17 . . . 330
iii. 17 322
iii. 19 217
iii. 20 110
iv. 6 22
iv. 11 . . . 355, 359
iv. 11, 12 . . 354
iv. 13 217
iv. 15, 16 . 245, 294
iv. 21 58
iv. 22, 24 . . . 409
iv. 24 . . . 145, 303
iv. 30 . . . 145, 296
v. 5 . . . 217, 219
v. 5, 6 183
v. 8 . . . 83, 304
v. 16 260
v. 16, 17 . . . 330
v. 18, 19 . . . **329**
v. 18, 21 . . . 373
v. 20 . . . 118, 325
v. 23 . . . 210, 293
v. 23, 27, 29, note 347
v. 25 343
v. 26 . 314, 361, 370
v. 29, 31 . . . 294
vi. 5-9 293
vi. 8 440
vi. 9 288
vi. 11, 12 . . . 193

PAGE

vi. 12 . . . 200, 228
vi. 16 199
vi. 17, 18 . . . 373
vi. 23, 24 . . . 217

PHILIPPIANS

i. 1 . . 346, 353, 354, 355, 356
i. 6 . . . . 329, 414 (note)
i. 9, 11 . . . 327
i. 19 . . . 294, 297
i. 21-24 . . . 420
i. 23 410
i. 27 133
ii. 4, 21 . . . 162
ii. 5 ff. . 253, 264, 327
ii. 6 . . . 218, 234
ii. 7 . . . . **235**
ii. 7, 8 226
ii. 9-11 . . 183, 246
ii. 10, 11 . . . 275
ii. 12 369
ii. 13 . 126, 152, 329
iii. 3 296
iii. 4 161
iii. 6, note . . 347
iii. 9 . . . 254, 322
iii. 10 328
iii. 11 . . . 426, 433
iii. 12 408
iii. 20, 21 . . . 293
iii. 21 . . . 427, 428
iv. 13 126

COLOSSIANS

i. 9 329
i. 14 . . . 319, 321
i. 14 . 260, 319, 321
i. 15 . . . 113, 217
i. 15-17 . . . 245
i. 16 . . . 118, 197
i. 16, 17 . . . 217
i. 16-20 . . . 275
i. 17 123
i. 18 . . . 217, 293
i. 18-20 . . 245, 246
i. 18-24, note . 347
i. 19 217

PAGE

i. 20 . 183, 193, 194, 260
i. 21-24 . . . 419
i. 23 . . . . **183**
ii. 5 132
ii. 9 218
ii. 10, 15 . . . 197
ii. 11, 12 . . . 315
ii. 12 . . . 362, **369**
ii. 16 399
ii. 18 197
iii. 3 294
iii. 3, 15 . . . 327
iii. 9, 10 . . 303, 409
iii. 10 145
iii. 12 317
iii. 16 372
iii. 25 288
iv. 5 260

1 THESSALONIANS

i. 9 . . . . . **114**
i. 7-9 146
iii. 12 317
iv. 13-17 . . 59, 181, 433, **436**
iv. 14 424
iv. 14, 15 . . . 426
iv. 15-17 . . . 217
iv. 16 197
iv. 16-17 . . . 431
v. 10 424
v. 12 355
v. 23 . . . . **133**

2 THESSALONIANS

i. 6-10 . 217, **436**, 439
i. 7 189
i. 7-9 146
i. 8, 9 . . . . **183**
i. 10-12 . . . 118
ii. 3-8 67
ii. 6 350
ii. 13 . . . 116, 330
ii. 13, 14 . . . 413
ii. 16 318
iii. 3 199
iii. 6 346
iii. 6, 14 . . . 348

PAGE

1 TIMOTHY

i. 5, 19 . . . 314
i. 12 373
i. 13 . . . . **285**
i. 15 246
i. 17 . . . 113, 114
i. 19, 20 . . 249, 250
i. 20 413
ii. 4 109
ii. 4-6 253
ii. 5 . 226, 248, 254, **256**
ii. 6 . 163, 260, 274
ii. 7 355
ii. 12 . . . 346, 349
iii. 1-7 354
iii. 2 . . . 355, 356
iii. 6 198
iii. 7 193
iii. 8-12 . . 353, 356
iii. 9 . . . 314, 356
iii. 11 . . . 355, 359
iii. 11-14 . . 354, 356
iii. 15 . 346, 347 (note)
iii. 16 . 190, 219, 314, 318
iv. 1 . 187, 193, 198, 297, 397
iv. 10 163
iv. 11-14 . . 354, 356
iv. 14 355
v. 1, 17 . . . 354
v. 3, 9 359
v. 8 . 64, 164, 193, 198, **350**
v. 19 350
v. 14 199
v. 17, 18, 19 . 346, 353, 355, **356**
v. 21 . . . 191, 192
v. 22 358
vi. 2 348
vi. 15, 16 . . . 113
vi. 19 216
vi. 20 373
vi. 22 358

2 TIMOTHY

i. 3 314
i. 6 65
i. 9 . . . . 116, 284

PAGE

i. 11 355
ii. 2 354
ii. 8 227
ii. 15 58
ii. 16 . . . . **77**
ii. 17, 18 . . . 350
ii. 26 . . . 193, 198
iii. 13 164
iii. 14-17 . . 67, 71
iii. 16, 17 . . . **82**
iv. 1, 8 . . . 217
iv. 3 355
iv. 5 359
iv. 11 67
iv. 14 413
iv. 18 . 217, 218, 227
iv. 18, 22 . . . 218

TITUS

i. 5 . 346, **355**, 356, 391
i. 5-9 . . . 350, 354
i. 7 . . . 355, 356
i. 9 356
ii. 13 . . . **219, 220**
ii. 14 . 260, 261, 318
ii. 15 346
iii. 5 . . 301, **314** f., 361, 370
iii. 7 . . . 318, 319
iii. 10 . 349, 350, 394
iii. 10, 11 . . 348

PHILEMON

12 387

HEBREWS

i. 1 . . . . 75, 222
i. 2, 3, 10 . . . 217
i. 2, 5, 8 . . . 217
i. 3 . . 123, 127, 217
i. 3, 4 293
i. 5 209
i. 8, 10 . . . 218
i. 12 113
i. 14 . 127, 187, 190, 192, 195, 197
ii. 2 . . . 160, 195
ii. 2, 6, 8 . . . 82
ii. 4 . . . 65, 126

PAGE

ii. 5 190
ii. 9 . . . 163, 278
ii. 10 . . . 118, 141
ii. 12 . . . 325, 347
ii. 14 . 199, 227, 228
ii. 14-16 . . . 246
ii. 17 . 174, 227, 228, 231, 252, 258, 274
ii. 18 237
iii. 1 207
iii. 3, 6 . . . 217
iii. 6 . . . 293, 348
iv. 1-3, 11 . . **411**
iv. 12 . . . . **133**
iv. 13 . . . 107, 113
iv. 14 217
iv. 15 . . . 227, 237
v. 2 227
v. 5 209
v. 7-10 228
v. 8 217
v. 12 355
v. 12-14 . . . 375
vi. 4-6 . . . **411**
vi. 6 217
vi. 8 181
vii. 3 217
vii. 25 . . . 264, 294
vii. 25, 26, 27 . 262
vii. 27 385
viii. 1 294
viii. 3 252
ix. 11-15 . . . 274
ix. 12 260
ix. 13, 14 . . . 370
ix. 14 314
ix. 14, 15, 28 . 254, **257**
ix. 15 . . . 260, 275
ix. 16, 22, 23, 26 252
ix. 22 321
ix. 24, 25, 28 . 226, 228, 262, 294
ix. 26, 28 . . 385
x. 1 . . . 82, 259
x. 10 385
x. 15 294
x. 20 387
x. 22 . . . 314, 361
x. 25 401
x. 26-32 . . . 411
x. 27 181

PAGE

x. 29 449
x. 30 103
xi. 3 121
xi. 6 325
xi. 13 82
xi. 30 105
xi. 35 260
xii. 6 325
xii. 9 . 132, **140** f., 142
xii. 15 355
xii. 22, 23 . . 197
xii. 23 . . . 181, 348 (note), 420
xii. 29 . . . 181
xiii. 2 192
xiii. 7, 17 346, 353, 354, 355
xiii. 13 . . . 373
xiii. 18 . . . 314
xiii. 20 . . . 355

JAMES

i. 1 217
i. 5 f. 337
i. 8, 9 210
i. 17 . 104, 113, 114
i. 18 . . . 284, 375
ii. 1 . . . 217, 288
ii. 5 284
ii. 9 373
ii. 21, 24, 25 . 318
ii. 26 132
iii. 1 355
iii. 2 408
iii. 14 350
iv. 2, 3 . . . 337
v. 14 355
v. 16 f. . . . 337

1 PETER

i. 1-3 . . . . **285**
i. 2 . 294, 296, 330
i. 3 . 216, 217, 219
i. 3-5 . . . 253, **413**
i. 3, 12 . . . 309
i. 3, 23 . . 301, 375
i. 5 . . . 320, 413
i. 7 181
i. 10, 11 . . 297, 445
i. 10-12, 16, 24, 25 70

PAGE

i. 10-12, 23 . . 82
i. 11 . . . 294, 445
i. 12 . 65, 190, 246
i. 14-16 . . . 145
i. 17 288
i. 18 261
i. 19 260
i. 23 . . . 310, 375
ii. 4 107
ii. 6-8 70
ii. 9 . 65, 303, 348
ii. 11 132
ii. 12 375
ii. 13 303
ii. 24 . 228, 254, **258**, 321
ii. 25 355
iii. 4 135
iii. 6, 10-12, 14, 20 70
iii. 15, 22 . . 217
iii. 18 . . . 132, 163
iii. 19 444
iii. 21 . 314, 315, 370, 371, 374
iii. 22 . . . 197, 293
iv. 6 444
iv. 11 . . . 80, 118
iv. 12 181
iv. 13 220
iv. 17, 18 . . . 183
iv. 18 70
iv. 19 . . . 132, 145
v. 1, 2 . . . 355
v. 1-4 354
v. 3 348
v. 8 . 193, 198, 199
v. 13 67
v. 14 346

2 PETER

i. 1, 8, 11, 14 . 217
i 4 . . . . **301** f.
i. 13 418
i. 14 418
i. 17 216
i. 19-21 . . 70, 82
i. 21 300
ii. 1 . . . 260, 278
ii. 1, 20 . . . 217
ii. 4 . . . 193, 194
ii. 5 373

PAGE

ii. 9 . 181, 444, 445
ii. 11 . 189, 191, 197
ii. 16 70
ii. 20, 21 . . . 164
ii. 20, 22 . . . 411
ii. 22 361
iii. 2 70
iii. 2, 13 . . . 82
iii. 6 181
iii. 7 411
iii. 8 114
iii. 8, 9 . . . 435
iii. 9 118
iii. 15, 16 . . 65
iii. 18 . 217, 317, 327

1 JOHN

i. 1 222
i. 1, 2 221
i. 2 224
i. 3 221
i. 8, 10 . . . **408**
i. 9 . . . . . **318**
ii. 1 . . . 294, 408
ii. 2 . 163, 258, 262, 264, 274, 278
ii. 2, 12 . . . 320
ii. 9, 10 . . . 304
ii. 13, 14 . . . 199
ii. 19, note . . 414
ii. 20 83
ii. 20, 27 . . . 329
ii. 23 221
ii. 29 301
iii. 4 160
iii. 8 . . . 193, 246
iii. 9 . . . 301, **408**
iii. 12 199
iii. 23 221
iv. 2 . . . 227, 234
iv. 6 199
iv. 7 . . . 164, 301
iv. 8, 18 . . . 109
iv. 9 270
iv. 9, 10 . . . 275
iv. 9, 10, 16 . . 118
iv. 9, 10, 19 . . 318
iv. 9, 11 . . . 253
iv. 10 . . . 258, 274
iv. 14, 15 . . . 221
iv. 19 . . . 145, 293
v. 1, 4, 18 . . 301

PAGE

v. 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20 . . . 221
v. 10, 12 . . . 322
v. 11, 12 . . . 224
v. 14 f. . . . 337
v. 16 . . . 262, 408
v. 18, 19 . . 199, **408**
v. 20 . **114**, 218, 221, **224** f.

2 JOHN

1 355
7 227

3 JOHN

1 355

JUDE

1, 4, 17, 21, 25 . 217
6 . . . . 191, 193
6-8 . . . . . **188**
9 . . . . 190, 197
14 191
16 288

REVELATION

i. 4, 5 . . . 296
i. 6 348
i. 10 401
i. 17 216
ii. 7 297
ii. 8 216
ii. 10, 25 . . . 411
ii. 18 216
ii. 23 . . . 58, 440
iii. 6 297
iv. 4 434
iv. 11-14 . . . 333
v. 2 190
v. 6 296
v. 9 . . . 252, 260
v. 11, 12 . . . 191
v. 11 . . . 191, 197
v. 12-14 . . . 216
vi. 10 114
vi. 15-17 . . . 146
vii. 1, 2 . . . 196
vii. 11 f. . . . 191

	PAGE
viii. 2, 6	197
ix. 11	198
x. 1	190
x. 6	114, 121
xii. 3, 4 f.	199
xii. 7	197, 199
xii. 7, 9	199
xii. 9	193, 198
xii. 10	193, 199
xiii. 2, 4	199
xiii. 8	252
xiv. 3	261
xiv. 4	261
xiv. 3, 4	260
xiv. 6, 7	118
xiv. 8	196
xiv. 13	297
xvi. 5	196
xviii. 21	190
xix. 7-9	385
xix. 10	197
xix. 11-16	216
xix. 14	197
xix. 17	196
xx. 1-3	190, 198
xx. 2	199
xx. 2, 3, 10	194
xx. 8	200
xx. 7, 10	193
xx. 4-6	59, **432, 434**
xx. 9	181
xx. 10-14	181
xx. 11-15	437, 439
xx. 12	440
xx. 13	434
xx. 13, 14	447
xxi. 8	181
xxi. 14	65
xxi. 22, 23	216
xxii. 1	237
xxii. 1, 3, 5	216
xxii. 5	439
xxii. 8, 9	197
xxii. 12 f.	440
xxii. 15	183, 274

TOPICAL INDEX

ACCOUNTABILITY for sin, 165, 170.
Adoption of believers as children of God, 318.
Agnostics, deny knowledge of God, 6.
Alexander (A.), 154.
Angel of Jehovah, identified with Christ, 206.
Angels, good and bad, 122, 186-200; literature, 186.
Annihilation of the wicked unscriptural, 179.
Anselm, 40.
Apollinaris' theory of Christ's person, 231.
Arminian hypothesis of accountability for sin, 172.
Arnold (A. N.), 288.
Atonement by self-sacrifice of God in Christ, 248-264; literature, 279; objections to author's view considered, 276; summary of truths concerning, 270-276; theories of, 264-270.
Attributes of God, literature, 109.
Augustine, 6, 298, 427.
Augustinian hypothesis of accountability for sin, 173.

BAPTISM and the Christian life, 312; external rite, 360; John's and Christian, 379; literature, 364, 366; of infants, 375; literature, 375, 379; significance of, 369; subjects of, 372.
Baptismal regeneration, 314.
Bell (C.), in Bridgewater Treatise, 34.
Bible, discrepancies in, literature, 102; objections to supreme authority answered, 86; a trustworthy revelation of God, 45-75.
Bibliolatry, 86.
Bipartite nature of men, 131.
Bliss (G. R.), 288, 434.
Boise (J. R.), 256.
Bowne (B. P.), 20, 176.
Bruce (A. B.), 278.
Bunyan (J.), 324.

CALVINISTIC hypothesis of accountability for sin, 174.
Canon of New Testament, literature, 47; Old Testament, literature, 69, 70.
Cautions to theological students, 6.
Cave (A.), 84.
Chace (G. I.), 126, 184.
Channing (W. E), 265.
Chase (I.), 371.
Christian Churches, 345-354.
Christian life, beginning and growth, 282-339; baptism, 312; election to, 283; gospel and the, 309; growth of, 317; Holy Spirit and, 294; human action in, 305; Jesus Christ and, 290.
Christian ministers, 354-358; literature, 354.
Christianity as an historical religion, 46; in the Roman empire, literature, 46.
Chronology of early Genesis, 95.
Church, courtesies of one to another, 351; defined, 349; dis-

cipline, 350; elections, 351; membership, 347; organization for mission work, 352; requisites for admission to, 349.
Churches, literature, 345.
Clarke (S.), 40.
Co-creation of human souls, 140.
Communicants at the Lord's Supper, 387.
Consubstantiation, 386.
Cooke (J. P.), 26.
Contradictory statements in Bible examined, 100.
Cousin (V.), 40.
Creation through the Word, 120.
Cyril's theory of Christ's person, 232.

Darwin (C.), 127.
Dawson (J. W.), 17, 35.
Deacons, 353.
Death, 180, 417; of unbelievers, 443.
Definitions: angels, 122, 186; atonement, 248; baptism, 360; bipartite nature of men, 131; Calvinism, 287; Christian life, 282; Christian religion, 3; Christian theology, 3; Church, 347; election, 287; faith, 308; grace, 109; holiness and love, 146; inerrancy, 55; inspiration, 63, 80; justice, 109; justification, 319; Lord's Supper, 383; love, 308; mercy, 109; miracles, 59; moral evil, 250; moral good, 249; moral quality of action, 151; moral perfection, 107; natural evil, 251; natural good, 249; patience of God, 109; personality of Jesus Christ, 238; prayer, 332; propitiation, 248; providence, 124; punishment, 176; redemption, 249; religion, 1, 38; repentance, 307; sanctification, 328; sin, 162; soul and spirit, 134; supernatural in revelation, 44; theism, 25; trustworthiness of historical records, 46; wisdom of God, 109; worship, 332.
Deity of the Holy Spirit, 294.
Deluge, 96.
Demons, 193, 198.
Demoniacal possession, literature, 198.
De Pressensé (E.), 223.
Design in Nature, 26.
De Wette (W. M. L.), 243.
Dewey, 136.
Diman (J. L.), 36.
Divine and human in Jesus Christ, 231.
Divinity of Jesus Christ, literature, 205.
Dorner (A.), 84, 120.
Dorner's theory of Christ's person, 238.
Duration of human life, 142.

Edwardean hypothesis of accountability for sin, 172.
Edwards (J.), 155.
Edwards (J., Jr.), 177.
Effects of incarnation on divine nature of Jesus Christ, 231; on human nature of Jesus Christ, 241.
Election, 283.
Eliot (G.), 179.
Emerson (R. W.), 154.
Ends of God in creation and providence, 149.
Eschatology, 416-450; literature, 440.
Eternal life, 179.
Ethics of the Old Testament, literature, 103.
Evidence, three kinds of, 5; probable, importance of, 5;
Evolution, 28.

Faculties of the soul in moral action, 149.
Fairbairn (A. M.), 184.
Faith, 308, 322.
Faith the condition of justification, 321.
Fallen angels, 193.
Falling from grace examined, 410.
Family, the, 343.
Fiske (J.), 24, 143, 418.

Forgiveness of sins, 318.
Four Gospels in first century, literature, 50; unity of, literature, 53.
Fourth Gospel, literature, 51.
Freewill, 151-157.
Future punishment, 176-185.

Genealogies of Jesus, 99; literature, 99.
Genetic hypothesis of creation, 28-41.
Gess' theory of Christ's person, 233.
God, and moral evil, 124; eternal, 114; immutable, 113; independent, 113; living and perfect, 39, 107; omnipresent, 115; omniscient, 107; personal and tripersonal, 110; revealed in nature, 17-41; revealed in Scripture, 42-106; self-sufficient, 111.
God upholds all things through the Word, 122.
God's end in creation, literature, 117; eternal purpose, 116-120.
Godet, 224.
Goodwin (D. R.), 134
Gospel, the, and the beginning of spiritual life, 310.
Gospels trustworthy, 49-55.
Governmental theory of atonement, 266.
Grace, 109.
Gray (A.), 31.
Green (T. S.), 222.
Growth in Christian life favored by worship, 331; study of God's word, 338; doing God's will, 339.
Guardian angels, 196.

Hackett (H. B.), 376.
Hades, and unbelievers, 444.
Hamilton (W.), 154.
Harris (S.), 26, 123.
Hatch (E.), 135.
Heard (J. B.), 419.
Heavenly body, the, 440.
Hengstenberg (E. W.), 370.
Higher Christian life, literature, 410.
Hill (T.), 26.
Historical errors in Bible considered, 98.
Holy Spirit, 294-304; literature, 283; and Christian growth, 328; deity of, 294; identical with spirit of God, 300; originator of Christian life, 301, 311; personality of, 295; objections to personality, 297.
Hope, and beginning of Christian life, 309.
Humanity of Jesus Christ, 226; literature, 226.

Immaculate conception of Mary, 242.
Immortality, 142, 181.
Imputation of Adam's sin, 175.
Incarnation of the Divine Word, 238; reasons for, 245.
Inerrancy of apostles, 66.
Infinite known but in part, 4, 5.
Inspiration, defined, 63, 85; and revelation, 80; gracious, 83; literature, 74, 75, 76, 78, 85; mode of, 76; plenary verbal, 76; plenary dynamical, 78, 85; promised by Jesus Christ, 63; religious dynamical, 80.
Intercessory prayer, 262.
Irving (E.), 242.
Irving's theory of incarnation, 242.

Jehovah of hosts, 190.
Jesus' claim to knowledge, 56.
Jesus' claim to divine prerogatives, 212.
Jesus' claims and doctrines, literature, 58.
Jesus' predictions fulfilled, 58.
Jesus Christ an infallible teacher, 55; and beginning of Christian life, 290; and growth in Christian life, 326; divine, 204-226; definition of his person, 238; human, 226-228; mediatorial king, 293; person and work, 203-279; prepara-

tion for his coming, 203; revealer of holiness and love, 290; source of spiritual life, 294; theories of his person, 231-238; unipersonal, 228-231.
Josephus, 69.
Judgment for believers, 438; for unbelievers, 448.
Justification by the Father, 317; on account of the work of Christ, 320; on condition of faith, 321; and sanctification, 323.

Lange (F. A.), 18.
Last day for the believer, 438-442; for the unbeliever, 448.
Leathes, 223.
Longevity of patriarchs, literature, 96.
Leo's theory of Christ's person, 233.
Lord's day, 399; observance of, 402.
Lord's Supper, 383; external rite, 383; import, 384; proper communicants, 387.
Lotze (H.), 21, 22, 123, 142, 156.
Love of God, 112, 253.
Love of man to God, 308.
Luthardt (C. E.), 224.

Macdonald (G.), 120.
Maclaren (A.), 306.
Mankind, nature, character and condition, 131-159; literature, 131.
Mansel (H. L.), 37.
Mason (A. J.), 258.
Materialistic hypothesis as to nature, 19.
Matheson (G.), 34.
Mediatorial work of Jesus Christ, 248.
Men bipartite by nature, 131-136; exposed to punishment for sin, 176-185; guilty and condemned, 171-176; moral, 36, 149; racial, 136-139; rational, 34; religious, 36; reproductive, 139-143; social, 143; who may be saved, 305.
Mercy of God, 109.
Messianic predictions of the person of Christ, 208-212.
Messner (H.), 369 f.
Meyer (H. A. W.), 218, 221.
Milton (J.), 179.
Mind, its normal action trustworthy, 4; weighs evidence, 5;
Miracles, literature, 60, 61; objections to, 60; wrought by Jesus Christ, 59.
Monism, objections to, 23.
Monistic hypothesis as to nature, 20.
Moral action voluntary, 150.
Moral evil, 250.
Moral good, 249.
Moral influence of Christ's death, 261, 292.
Moral influence theory of atonement, 264.
Moral law defined, 144; source, 144; content, 145.
Moral quality where discovered, 150.
Moral Responsibility, 43, 158.
Moral teaching of Bible, 103.
Morris (J.), 25.
Mosaic sacrifice, 259.
Mueller (J.), 112, 140.

Nature, all parts interdependent, 17, 18; appearance of animal life, 31, 32; mankind as rational, moral and religious beings, 33-40; of vegetable life, 29, 30; arguments for monistic hypothesis of, 21-23; for theistic hypothesis of, 25; from order and design, 25-27; definition, 17; formation of atoms, 29; genetic history in theistic argument, 29-40; its revelation of God imperfect, 41; materialistic hypothesis, 18, 19; monistic hypothesis, 20; objections to argument from design, 27, 28; objections to materialistic hypothesis, 19; objections to monistic hypothesis, 23, 24; objections to theistic view, 32, 33.
Natural evil, 250.

Natural evil both retributive and beneficent, 184.
Natural good, 249.
Neighborhood life, 344.
Nestorius' theory of Christ's person, 232.
New birth, 301, 311.
New Testament use of Old Testament, literature, 70, 71; quotations from Old Testament, literature, 93.
Northrup (G. W.), 310.

Old Testament canon, 70; literature on, 69; quoted in New Testament, 70; scriptures as historical records, 72; scriptures, from God, 68-75.
Omnipotence of God, 110.
Omniscience of God, 107.
Ordinances enjoined by the New Testament, 359.
Ordination for Christian service, 358.
Orelli (C.), 259.
Organic union theory of atonement, 269.
Origin of sin, literature, 163.
Original sin, 171-175.

Pain, 177, 250.
Paradise, or the middle state, 420.
Pardon for sin, 317 f.
Park (E. A.), 266.
Pastors of churches, 354.
Patience of God, 109.
Pelagian hypothesis of accountability for sin, 171.
Pepper (G. D. B.), 300.
Perfection of Christian service and character, 407.
Personality of God, 110; of Jesus Christ, 238; cf Holy Spirit, 295.
Phelps (A.), 438.
Philosophical speculation dangerous, 7.
Placean hypothesis of accountability for sin, 173.
Plumptre (C. E.), 434.
Prayer, 332; and election to salvation, 286; intercessory, 262; objections founded on ignorance, 334; founded on order of nature, 335-338.
Precreation of human souls, 139.
Predictions, alleged to be false, 102; made by Jesus Christ, 58.
Preservation of the saints, 413.
Procreation of human souls, 141.
Propitiation, 248, 258.
Providence of God, 124-128, 288, 325.
Punishment for wrongdoing, 176, 251, 273.
Purpose of God eternal, 116-120.

Qualifications for theological study, 8.
Quotations of Old Testament in New Testament, 93.

Ransom by Christ, 260.
Redemption by Christ, 248.
Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, 301.
Religion, Christian, defined, 3, 5.
Repentance, 307.
Responsibility for sin in others, 168.
Responsibility, theories of, 171-176.
Restoration of the wicked denied, 182.
Resurrection, 422-438; and progress of the Christian life, 437; at death, denied, 429; just before millennium denied, 432; literature, 423, 432; of believers, 426; of believers at end of present age, 429, 437; of Jesus, 423; of unbelievers, 447.
Retributive justice, 176.
Revelation in nature insufficient, 41; objections to written, 42; progressive, 89, 115.
Righteousness of God, 108, 254.
Rothe (R.), 442.
Rousseau (J. J.), 335.
Royce (J.), 19, 20.

Sacred scriptures adapted to their recipients, 85.
Sanctification by the Holy Spirit, 328; completed at death, 409; related to justification, 323.
Satan, 193, 199.
Schurman (J. G.), 4, 156.
Science and religion, literature, 87.
Science and the scriptures, 86, 95.
Scriptures in the time of Christ, 69.
Self-sacrifice of Christ, 252-279; due to God's love, 253; due to God's righteousness, 254; an intercession, 262; author's view, 272-276; objections to author's view, 277; necessary, 252; propitiatory, 258; a ransom, 260; for all men, 278.
Seneca, 163.
Sin, defined variously, 160; degrees of, 164; universal, 162; and evil, literature, 87; related to God's eternal purpose, 119.
Sinlessness of Jesus, 242.
Smith (G.), 120.
Soul and spirit, 134.
Spirit of God, 300.
Spiritual discernment, 309.
Spiritual life a new birth, 301; a divine calling, 303; a new creation, 303; a resurrection, 302.
Spiritualism, 200.
Strong (A. H.), 437.
Stubbs (C. W.), 450.
Study of God's world, word and providence favorable to Christian growth, 338.
Substitutionary theory of atonement, 267.
Suffering in the world, 118.
Summum bonum, 147.
Supernatural action, 44.
Suum cuique, 146.
Teleology, 26.
Tennyson (A.), 335.
Theism, literature, 25, 26.
Theology, Christian, definition of, 3; dependent on nature and revelation, 4; furnishes data for apologetic, polemic and comparative, 4; postulates of, 4; depends on experience, 9; qualification for study of, 8, 9; benefits of study of, 9, 10; divisions of, 10, 11; based on the Trinity, 11; Christocentric, 11, 12; governmental, 12; remedial, 12; of Bible alleged to be bad, 104.
Theism, *a priori* arguments for, 39 f.
Theistic hypothesis of creation reasonable, 25.
Thomasius' theory of Christ's persons, 237.
Thompson (W.), 19.
Thoreau (H. D.), 177.
Total depravity, 164.
Transubstantiation, 385.
Trinity, the, 110-113, 298; literature, 113.
Tripartite nature of man denied, 133.
Tyndall (J.), 30.

Unity of mankind, 136; literature, 136.
Union of believers with Christ, 323, 327.

Van Oostersee (J. J.), 330.

Wallace (A. R.), 336.
Winchell (A.), 137.
Wisdom of God, 109.
Worship, 331.
Worship, family, 343.

OCT 10 1900

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 131 109 6